

CHURCH HISTORY

SEPTEMBER, 1936

Deaths of Clergy

Hayden V. White

The Political Resistance of the Calvinists
in France and the Low Countries

Robert M. Kingdon

Revolutionary Calvinist Parties in England
under Elizabeth I and Charles I

Leo F. Salt

The Rule of the Saints in American Politics, Josiah C. Bruner

Continental Influence on American
Christian Thought Since World War I

Sidney E. Ahlstrom



THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1958

George H. Williams	President	Robert S. Michaelson	Asst. Sec.
Robert T. Handy	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. H. Nichols	Editors
(1100 S. Goodman St., Rochester 20, N. Y.)		F. A. Norwood	

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Sidney E. Mead	H. Shelton Smith
Carl E. Schneider	Jerald C. Brauer
Leonard J. Trinterud	Harold Grimm
Quirinus Breen	Lefferts A. Loetscher

ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	E. R. Hardy, Jr.
Winfred E. Garrison	Harold S. Bender
William Warren Sweet	Percy V. Norwood
Courad H. Mochmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Loetscher	Matthew Spinka
John T. McNeill	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Pauck	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Masey H. Shepard	Ray C. Petry
Roland H. Bainton	Sandford Fleming

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in *CHURCH HISTORY* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *CHURCH HISTORY*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publisher's Office is in Berns, Indiana.

Entered as second class under March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berns, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (<i>Divinity School, Yale University</i>)	RAY C. PETRY (<i>Divinity School, Duke University</i>)
R. PIERCE BEAVER (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	MATTHEW SPINKA (<i>Hartford Theological Seminary, Emeritus</i>)
ROBERT GRANT (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	WILHELM PAUCK (<i>Union Theological Seminary</i>)
WINTHROP S. HUDSON (<i>Colgate-Rochester Divinity School</i>)	JOHN DILLENBERGER (<i>Divinity School, Drew University</i>)
SIDNEY E. MEAD (<i>Meadville Theological School</i>)	EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (<i>Princeton Theological Seminary</i>)

VOL. XXVII

SEPTEMBER, 1958

No. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PONTIUS OF CLUNY, THE CURIA ROMANA AND THE END OF GREGORIANISM IN ROME <i>Hayden V. White</i>	195
THE POLITICAL RESISTANCE OF THE CALVINISTS IN FRANCE AND THE LOW COUNTRIES <i>Robert M. Kingdon</i>	220
REVOLUTIONARY CALVINIST PARTIES IN ENGLAND UNDER ELIZABETH I AND CHARLES I <i>Leo F. Solt</i>	234
THE RULE OF THE SAINTS IN AMERICAN POLITICS <i>Jerald C. Brauer</i>	240
CONTINENTAL INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT SINCE WORLD WAR I <i>Sydney E. Ahlstrom</i>	256
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	273
JOHN WYCLIF IN THE PREACHING TRADITION	W. Mallard, Jr.
JOHN LEADLEY DAGG	R. G. Gardner

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

274

- BURGHARDT, WALTER J.: *The Image of God in Man According to Cyril of Alexandria* Robert M. Grant
- MCCRACKEN, GEORGE E. AND CABANISS, ALLEN, eds.: *Early Medieval Theology* Ray C. Petry
- RYAN, J. JOSEPH: *Saint Peter Damiani and His Canonical Sources* Ronald E. Osborn
- SCAMMELL, G. V.: *Hugh Du Puiset* Joseph H. Dahmus
- FRASER, C. M.: *A History of Antony Bek* Joseph H. Dahmus
- COHN, NORMAN: *The Pursuit of the Millennium* Michael Fixler
- PETRY, RAY C.: *Late Medieval Mysticism* Matthew Spinka
- SPITZ, LEWIS W.: *Conrad Celtis* Quirinus Breen
- MOSSE, GEORGE L.: *The Holy Pretence: A Study in Christianity and Reason of State from William Perkins to John Winthrop* Winthrop S. Hudson
- BAHLMAN, DUDLEY W.: *The Moral Revolution of 1688* William A. Bultmann
- JAMES, FRANCIS GODWIN: *North Country Bishop: A Biography of William Nicholson* Alan Simpson
- SYKES, NORMAN: *William Wake* Winthrop S. Hudson
- GAUSTAD, EDWIN SCOTT: *The Great Awakening in New England* Stow Persons
- POCHMANN, HENRY A.: *German Culture in America, 1600-1900* Sydney E. Ahlstrom
- DUFFY, JOHN, ed.: *Parson Clapp of the Strangers' Church of New Orleans* Walter B. Posey

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL, April 19, 1958

288

PONTIUS OF CLUNY, THE *CURIA ROMANA* AND THE END OF GREGORIANISM IN ROME

HAYDEN V. WHITE, *University of Rochester*

Scholarly opinion is generally agreed that the order of Cluny reached its apogee during the abbacy of St. Hugh, who ruled from 1049 to 1109, and began its decline as a result of the misrule of his successor, Pontius of Melgueil, abbot from 1109 to 1122.¹ The rule of Pontius' successor, Peter the Venerable (1122-1157), is generally regarded as an attempt to realize two aims: justification of Cluniac monasticism before the criticism of St. Bernard of Clairvaux and reparation of the damage done to the spiritual life at Cluny by Pontius.² It is the purpose of this article to subject the accepted view of Pontius' career to scrutiny and to present an alternative interpretation of the known facts. This alternative view will be based upon the demonstration that the available evidence concerning Pontius' disgrace and condemnation can be properly understood only if it is set into the context of events which transpired in the Roman Curia from 1112 to 1130.³

I

A superficial appraisal of Pontius' life and career at Cluny would seem to justify casting him in the role of scapegoat for Cluny's decline during the twelfth century. He died a prisoner of Honorius II in December 1126, branded an excommunicate and schismatic, and he apparently died unrepentant to the very end.⁴ Furthermore, he died condemned by two heroes of his century, St. Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable, who, if they disagreed on other matters, were in accord in their conviction that Pontius' disgrace and death constituted a fitting end to a career marked by an unholy pride verging upon megalomania.⁵ The only writer who shows any sympathy for Pontius is Ordericus Vitalis, and he is forced to recur to an apothegm in order to explain the curious course of his career: "*Principium fini solet impar esse videri.*" (Often the beginning differs from the end.)⁶ Modern scholars have tended to range themselves along the lines set down by the medieval writers. When they do not, with Bernard and Peter, condemn Pontius outright, they fall back upon Ordericus' opinion and agree that he was truly an enigma.⁷

The difficulty with the accepted view is that it does not accommodate the opinion of Pontius' pre-Bernardine contemporaries, men every bit as trustworthy as Bernard and Peter, who saw in Pontius the very model of the Gregorian churchman. Indeed, both his natural endowments and his background were such as to force Pontius into the forefront of the Gregorian struggle with the Empire for the *libertas ecclesiae*.

Sprung from the Burgundian nobility, Pontius of Melgueil was eminently suited to the role of the leader of the most powerful religious order of his day. He was nobly born, cultivated, an acute administrator, and courageous to a fault.⁸ According to Ordericus, his reputation for holiness was such that St. Hugh himself had chosen him as his successor at Cluny, and his election was unanimous.⁹ Under his rule arts and letters flourished at Cluny, and if work on the abbatial basilica languished, this was only because Pontius had directed the order's energies into new channels.¹⁰ These new channels were suggested by the problems which confronted the Church as it entered the final stages of its conflict with the Empire over investitures. Pontius abandoned his order's traditional neutrality in this struggle and unequivocally ranged Cluny's vast resources behind the papal cause.¹¹ During the period 1112-1122 he was one of the mainstays of the Gregorian movement both in Italy and in France.

The ties between Cluny and Rome were strengthened by the close relationship which existed between Pontius and the various popes of the first quarter of the twelfth century. Pontius was the godson of Paschal II and the pope's love for Pontius enriched the order immeasurably.¹² Gelasius II, driven from Rome by civic disorders, sought refuge at Cluny and ultimately died there.¹³ According to one tradition, Pontius was selected by that pope to succeed him, but Pontius chose to play the role of arbiter of canonical procedure in the election of his friend Guy, the bishop of Vienne, who succeeded Gelasius as Calixtus II.¹⁴ The bond of friendship between the two men was strengthened in the early years of Calixtus' pontificate. Honors were heaped upon Cluny and special commissions granted to Pontius. The new pope chose Pontius to represent him in negotiations with Henry V, rewarded him with a cardinal's hat, and cited the order under Pontius as "mirror of monastic life" in the West.¹⁵ In a decade of rule, Pontius had scaled the heights of power in the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Yet suddenly, in the very year in which papal-Cluniac relations seemed most cordial, Pontius resigned his abbacy and departed on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. There he was received as though he were a saint and given the honor of carrying the Holy Lance in a sortie against the Saracens outside the walls of Jerusalem.¹⁶ He remained in the East for over a year, returning to Italy in 1124. Whether he approached Calixtus and was rejected or whether he preferred to withdraw to the solitude of monastic life without the permission of the pope is unknown. In any event, he settled for a while at a little monastery built by himself in the diocese of Treviso and there remained until the spring of 1125. Then, leaving his retreat and crossing the Alps, he descended upon Cluny, seized it by force of arms and re-installed him-

self as abbot.¹⁷ In the following spring, 1126, he was summoned to Rome by Calixtus' successor, Honorius II, to stand trial for treason.¹⁸

Pontius immediately abandoned Cluny and presented himself in Rome, but after his arrival he refused to appear before Honorius II. He is supposed to have declared that no living mortal might judge him, to St. Peter alone that right belonged, and refused to beg absolution from the ban of excommunication which had been pronounced against him.¹⁹ He was therefore arrested, convicted without hearing and committed to imprisonment in Rome. He languished in prison for a few months before expiring of "Roman fever" in December 1126.²⁰ His body was removed to Cluny by Peter the Venerable and there interred in consecrated ground. According to one tradition, his grave became an object of veneration to many who regarded him as a saint.²¹ But to the pope, the Curia, and the men of the new ascetic orders north of the Alps such as St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable, an instrument of Satan had been dealt with as befitted his life.

These are the salient facts of Pontius' career. It is a strange course of events which transformed a pillar of Gregorian orthodoxy into a nemesis both of the Papacy and the monastic movement as a whole. And while we must not rule out the possibility of psychological transmutation, it hardly seems possible to see his fall as the logical outcome of a decadent nature, as his enemies would have us see it. Quite the contrary. Pontius' actions were thoroughly consistent throughout his entire career. It was Cluny and Rome that had changed. Pontius was judged by a world he never made, a world in which he and his type of churchman were anachronisms. The clue to Pontius' downfall lies in a revolution which took place in Rome with the advent of Pontius' judge, Honorius II. Pontius was the first victim to fall in a revolution which heralded the end of the Gregorian Papacy in Rome and the end of old style monasticism in the West.

II

As Toynbee argues, the danger of every revolutionary, creative minority is that it may turn into a *dominant* minority, ruling by force alone and confusing its own interests with the interests of the institution which it leads.²² A sure sign of leadership stagnation is obsession with one ideal or goal to the exclusion of the legitimate ideals or goals of the mass. When the leadership élite becomes concerned with maintaining itself to the point where the mass feels it can no longer realize its own goals under the incumbent leadership, charismatic leaders appear in the mass and prepare to seize the leadership mechanism which the élite, or dominant minority, has betrayed.²³ This is what happened during the last generation of the Gregorian movement.

The first phase of transition from creative to dominant minority spanned the pontificates of Paschal II, Gelasius II, and Calixtus II. It was marked by the seizure of leadership power in Rome by the Curia and the open rejection of ascetic ideals as the proper guides to papal policy. The drama began with the curial rebellion against Pope Paschal II following the so-called "humiliation of Sutri" of the year 1111.

From the very first years of his pontificate, Pope Paschal II had shown himself to be a deviation from the type of pope which the Gregorians had traditionally considered necessary to the proper implementation of the Gregorian program. Unlike Gregory VII and Urban II, he was possessed of a genuinely otherworldly spirit and devoted to the monastic-ascetic ideals of poverty and charity.²⁴ Furthermore, he seemed to agree with the men of the new ascetic orders then forming in France that the *libertas* of the Church was sufficiently well established to allow the Papacy to turn its attention away from the struggle with the laity to the task of effecting a thoroughgoing moral reform of the entire Christian *communitas*.²⁵ In accordance with his principles, he had entered into negotiations with the kings of France and England, and he had been rewarded in 1106-1107 with settlements which had effectively resolved the dispute over investitures in those countries.²⁶ However, he had achieved these goals only at the price of abandoning a strictly Gregorian conception of the episcopal office and embracing the Chartrian position on investitures.

In the Chartrian view, investiture was not a doctrinal problem, but an administrative rule which might be applied, altered or ignored as the individual pope saw fit or as the individual political situation demanded.²⁷ The Curia, composed of the heirs of Gregorianism, seems to have opposed Paschal's program from the beginning, yet it could do little to prevent the pope from pursuing it so long as it showed every evidence of success.²⁸ But the "humiliation of Sutri," which grew out of Paschal's attempts to apply the program to the German situation, gave the Gregorians in the Curia the justification which they needed to chastise the pope publicly and assert their right to a voice in the formulation of papal policy.

The Curia was undoubtedly scandalized by the offer made by Paschal II to Henry V at Sutri wherein the pope had agreed to restore to the emperor all of the *regalia* given by Henry's predecessors to the Church, if Henry, in his turn, would renounce all claim to the right of investing bishops.²⁹ At first Henry had seemed disposed to accept the papal offer, but a few days later in Rome, he had rejected it, taken the pope prisoner, and extracted from him (by whatever means) a statement granting him the right of investiture as well as a papal promise that he (Henry) would never be excommunicated.³⁰

Now it must be noted that even at Sutri and Rome Paschal acted in a manner completely consistent with his personal ideals. His devotion to *paupertas* was manifested in his willingness to trade the secular wealth of the Church for its *libertas*. His *caritas* was shown in his willingness to cede the right of investiture to Henry rather than subject the populace of Italy to another decade of war.³¹ All in all, Paschal had emerged from his encounter with Henry with his position strengthened. He had taken a position which could not but redound to his reputation for holiness in the eyes of the devotees of the new asceticism. Christendom was shocked by Henry's actions, and had the Curia backed Paschal's stand there is no reason not to assume that the turmoil which marked the next two decades of papal history could have been averted. But instead of turning its ire upon Henry, the Gregorians both within and without the Curia attacked Paschal himself for his weakness. In so doing they effectively attacked monastic-ascetic ideals themselves and alienated that faction in the Church which was devoted to the same otherworldliness as that which informed Paschal's program.

It is difficult to state with certainty whether the criticism of Paschal sprang from the pope's surrender of the right of investiture to Henry V (made under duress) or from his offer (made under no duress whatsoever) to renounce the *temporalia* in return for an imperial guarantee of ecclesiastical *libertas*. Either of the moves could be interpreted as endangering the secular power of the Church and thus, by implication, the very existence of that body created by the Gregorians to administer that power, the *Curia Romana*. In a sense, therefore, the Curia was fighting for its very life. But it went too far. In presuming to criticize the papal action and Paschal's leadership virtues publicly, the Curia laid open to public criticism the entire leadership mechanism of the Church. It created a schism in the head of the Church which directed the critical attention of Christendom to the bureaucratic machine which had emerged from the Gregorian movement with more power than the pope himself. It revealed, furthermore, to the ascetic wing of the Church that power, not moral reform, was the curial party's prime interest. As events progressed, it became obvious that if a genuine moral reform were to be realized, the pope must first be freed from his subservience to the administrators who manned the curial machine.

One of the fundamental tenets of the Gregorian program was the idea that the papal office stood above criticism from any human source on the basis of the morality of its occupant. The pope held his power from Christ directly, it was argued, not by virtue of his personal worthiness, but on the basis of his legal election to the episcopal see of Rome.³² This idea had been advanced originally in order to cut the Papacy free from interference by such secular rulers as Henry III who had pre-

sumed to order the Holy See on the basis of the immorality of individual popes.³³ Whether the pope might be corrected in matters of doctrinal error and who was to correct him were still open questions, although some canonical collections implied that the right of correcting him resided in the Curia or the College of Cardinals.³⁴

During the pontificate of Urban II the rise of the power and prestige of the College of Cardinals, the center of the Curia, had given rise to a kind of "curial constitutionalism" which implied that the Curia, as the papal Senate, participated in the plenitude of power which inhered in the Holy See.³⁵ Individual cardinals had voiced their right of participation in the papal power, but while strong popes such as Urban II occupied the see of Peter, they had little opportunity to turn the Curia into an independent body.³⁶ In the early years of Paschal's reign the College of Cardinals and the Curia extended their powers and assumed the right, hitherto reserved to the pope alone, to judge all other orders in the hierarchy.³⁷ After the "humiliation of Sutri" this newly acquired power was turned against the papal office itself. Paschal was accused of courting heresy, and the Curia moved to correct him in the name of Gregorian orthodoxy. It was a thinly disguised attempt to chastise the otherworldly Paschal for his otherworldliness. Thus envisaged, the curial reaction might be easily construed in the provinces as an anti-monastic or anti-ascetic move which would separate the pope from his flock and make permanent that separation by further extension of curial strength. For a brief while the sacerdotalists were in the ascendancy. Paschal II was forced to bow to the whim of his Curia.

The curial party was composed of men fanatically devoted to the ideals of Gregory VII and Urban II—as they interpreted those ideals. To them neither of the agreements between Henry and Paschal was possible. They saw the power of the Church in purely material terms: without the weapons of the world, the Church could have little say in the direction of the world. It was well, in their view, to distinguish between the ideal and the practical aspects of Church rule. Let the monk retire to his monastery and leave the direction of the Church to those accustomed to the realities of political power. So argued Cono of Palestrina, Peter of Porto, the members of the Pierleoni family in Rome, John of Gaeta, Bishop Bruno of Segni (abbot of Monte Cassino), and a host of the younger members of the Curia, most of whom were canon lawyers. These Italian prelates were seconded in France by Gerard of Angoulême, Geoffrey of Vendôme, Guy of Vienne and Jusserand of Lyons.³⁸ To this list must be added the name of Pontius of Cluny who, from this date on, appears as a regular member of the curial entourage.³⁹ He had cast his lot with the Church against the emperor, but he had also associated himself with the most radical of the politicians

who frequented the Curia. His action could not but be interpreted as an indication of his worldliness.

There is no reason to challenge the integrity of this rebellious party. They could see the issues in no other terms. They were men of the eleventh, not the twelfth, century, men bred in a violent world which admitted only force and action. But the world was changing, standing on the edge of a new civility, one in which the rough feudality would be transformed into the order of chivalry, in which the veneration of St. Michael would be lost to veneration of the Blessed Virgin, one in which society would try to put aside for a while the violence of a darker age. In rejecting Paschal the radicals were rejecting the century which stood before them waiting to be born and destroying the links between themselves and the masses.

Bruno of Segni stated the curial position most forcefully. For Bruno, Paschal had failed to measure up to the ideal of papal leadership virtues as exemplified in Leo IX, Gregory VII and Urban II. He publicly berated the pope for his weakness in the face of physical threats on Henry's part.⁴⁰ Furthermore, he held that any impartial examination of Gregorian law would support his contention that lay investiture was heresy, and he concluded that if the pope disagreed, he was guilty of heresy.⁴¹ And he implied that if the pope should persist in his heretical posture he would have to be dealt with as a heretic. For Bruno and his supporters the shadow of Gregory VII was a more potent force than the reality of Paschal II. Like all fanatics, he identified his own desires with those of God.⁴²

Bruno's letters were made public and were seconded by other members of the Curia.⁴³ Paschal stood faced with open rebellion and the possibility of schism if he did not reject his agreement with Henry. At the Lateran Council of 1112 the Curia prevailed upon Paschal to sign a sort of "confession of faith" in which he promised to remain loyal to the Gregorian program—as the Curia interpreted that program—in both the ends envisaged and the means by which those ends were to be realized.⁴⁴

But this was not sufficient for the radicals in France. Jusserand of Lyons and Guy of Vienne sought to convene a synod at Anse for the express purpose of censuring the pope.⁴⁵ They were foiled in this move only by the refusal of Ivo of Chartres to join them. Ivo held that no man might correct the pope in any matter, much less in a matter which was purely political.⁴⁶ Ivo's intransigency brought a bitter retort from Jusserand, but the move to censure was abandoned.⁴⁷ Instead, the French radicals convened at Vienne and there drew up a statement branding lay investiture a heresy and demanding a papal confirmation of this action.⁴⁸ Unwillingly Paschal bowed to the pres-

tures brought to bear upon him. He confirmed the Vienne decisions and salvaged for himself only the satisfaction of knowing that the power of his most potent critic, Bruno of Segni, was halved.⁴⁹ Otherwise, the curial party's victory was complete. It had made good its claim to the right of correcting the pope in matters of doctrinal error and it had succeeded in delegating to itself the right of determining what was doctrine and what was not. We do not know how St. Bernard viewed the events of 1111-12 in Rome, but can one suppose that the author of the *De Consideratione* and the mentor of the saintly Eugenius III greeted the curial victory with joy?

Paschal himself, disheartened and defeated, sought to abdicate, but such a move would have discredited the curial victory and he was prevailed upon to remain in office.⁵⁰ The only portion of his honor which remained intact was that buttressed by his refusal to renounce his promise not to excommunicate Henry V. Ultimately the Curia did not even leave him this. In 1116 Paschal was forced to revoke his pledge and under pressure of the Curia ratify Cono of Palestrina's excommunication of the emperor.⁵¹

All Europe knew that the Curia controlled the pope rather than vice versa. The clergy could not be oblivious to the fact that the Church itself was now ruled by a committee composed of the Curia and dominated by men who were more interested in maintaining the *temporalia* than in aiding the new reform orders in the implementation of a moral reform. Pontius' alliance with the Curia could not have helped raise him in the estimation of the men devoted to the new ideal. The abbot of Cluny had bound his fortune and that of his order to a group devoted to a struggle which was fast losing its immediacy. He stood in the highest councils of the leadership élite, but that élite was rapidly losing favour with the masses. The development of the papal program from the death of Paschal II to the death of Calixtus II did little to offset the offensive picture of the Curia which was created as a result of the revolt against Paschal.

The Curia confirmed its rejection of ascetic ideals as determinants of papal policy in the election of John of Gaeta (a humanist-scholar from Monte Cassino) as Gelasius II and then, in 1119, the election of Guy of Vienne, Paschal's most virulent critic, as Calixtus II.⁵² Calixtus was the first secular cleric to hold the papal office since Leo IX. Prior to his election he had achieved fame primarily as the despoiler of St. Hugh of Grenoble, as briber of the Curia, and as persecutor of Paschal II.⁵³ That Pontius should have been instrumental in the election of Calixtus certainly could not have endeared him to the men of the new orders in France. Yet Calixtus' martial spirit and his worldly attainments stood him in good stead in a Papacy fighting for its world-

ly power, and it was he who succeeded in bringing the investiture struggle to a close with the Concordat of Worms of 1122.

Some have found difficulty in explaining the fact that the Concordat of Worms assumed the very Chartrian interpretation of the episcopal office which had been so vehemently criticized by Calixtus during Paschal II's pontificate. Historians of Calixtus' reign have sought to escape the difficulty by arguing that a miraculous change came over that pope after his election to the papal power, that the feudal warrior-bishop was transformed into the pious defender of traditional ideals with the assumption of his responsibilities.⁵⁴ But such a view is myopic at best. The Chartrian character of the Concordat of Worms was accepted by Calixtus because he was less interested in any particular interpretation of the episcopal office than in maintaining control of the *temporalia*. Paschal had used the Chartrian view to threaten the secular power of the hierarchy; at Worms that same view was used to effect peace with the Empire while maintaining ecclesiastical control of the *temporalia*. It mattered little to Calixtus what theory underlay the settlement.

This interest in practice rather than theory characterized the whole of Calixtus' pontificate, and it was merely an extension of practices which characterized his episcopal career. There was little in either to hearten the ascetic orders then coming into their own in France. For example, even though he presented himself as leader of a moral reformation, he saw nothing strange in preaching a crusade against fellow Christians if the political goals of the Papacy could be realized thereby.⁵⁵ He sought to exclude members of the new religious orders from the public life of the Church, while at the same time extending unprecedented privileges and honors to the older, feudalistic monastic orders such as Cluny and Monte Cassino.⁵⁶ Further evidence of his anti-ascetic attitude could be adduced from his refusal to grant license to Norbert of Xanten to preach his reform.⁵⁷ Finally, under his leadership the Curia attained to a style of life which threatened to challenge the Byzantine court in its magnificence. The building program undertaken by Gelasius II and continued by Calixtus II in Rome could hardly have endeared the pope to the writer of the *Apologia* and the *De Consideratione*.⁵⁸ There is little wonder that we have no record of any correspondence between Calixtus II and St. Bernard, who was rapidly becoming the most powerful figure in the monastic life of the time. This is because Calixtus and his Curia presented themselves as the heirs of the Gregorian tradition, a sacerdotal tradition, and were recognized throughout the Church to be unsympathetic to ascetic ideals in general.⁵⁹ Bernard knew an enemy when he saw one, and in the year 1119 he condemned Calixtus, Pontius, the Curia and Cluny in a

sweeping charge of corruption which presaged the revolution that would soon deprive them of their power in the Church.

Bernard's first epistle was written to his cousin at Cluny but it was undoubtedly meant for general circulation. Here Bernard condemned his enemies, both individual and institutional, *en masse*. Bernard's cousin had defected from Clairvaux to Cluny, Bernard had demanded his return, Pontius had appealed to Rome, and the Curia had ruled in favour of the abbot of Cluny. In his letter, Bernard insists that his side of the case was never heard in Rome (impugning thus the integrity of the Curia), that he was judged unfairly and that it is becoming increasingly evident that referral of a case to Rome usually results in the compounding of injustice rather than equity.⁶⁰

But even more interesting than the specific charges brought against Pontius and the Curia is the psychology of revolt manifested in this letter. It is a charismatic psychology, one born of the conviction that the law of God as divined by the prophet is superior to that of the priest and the hierarchy. Finding no justice in the authorized institutions, the prophet-reformer falls back upon divine inspiration and makes his own justice. In a letter written to Bruno of Cologne in 1124 Bernard revealed the conflict prompted by his own sense of moral rectitude-as it encountered the formal ecclesiastical hierarchy: how was it possible, he asked, for the command of an abbot or even the permission of the pope himself to make an evil action good? Actions were in themselves good or evil, and evil actions could never be justified, no matter what authority commanded them.⁶¹ This is not to say that Bernard questioned the authority of the Papacy as an institution, but his respect for the institution never restrained his castigation of the man who occupied the papal chair.⁶² On more than one occasion he justified his criticism of an errant pope by the simple expedient of questioning his legitimacy. In fact, it was Bernard more than any other single person who was responsible for the decline of the curial style of life and its realistic political policy; he it was who purged it of the men who had raised it to power, canon lawyers, Roman lawyers, and dialecticians. In his *De Consideratione* he even composed a *speculum paparum* which reserved to the lowest orders of the hierarchy the right of criticizing the persons of those who occupied the highest offices.⁶³ In sum, Bernard's sense of divine election destroyed his own will and merged it with the will of God, at least in his own mind. Therefore, he saw nothing at all anomalous in judging and correcting the authorized institutions of the Church at the very moment when he was arguing that as institutions they were above judgment.

Bernard's first epistle, written in 1119, called the Church to judgment for allowing its head to become corrupt and promised a day of

vengeance for the injustices he had suffered at the hands of Calixtus II, the Curia and Pontius of Cluny:

But He will come, He will come who will judge again the judgments of men, who will confute what has been unlawfully vowed, who will execute judgment for them that suffer wrong, who will judge the poor with justice and reprove with equity on behalf of the meek of the earth. . . . There is coming a day of judgment on which a pure heart will count more than astute words and a good conscience more than a full purse, for that judge will not be swayed by discourse nor won by gifts. To your tribunal, Lord Jesus, I appeal; to your judgment I commit my cause, 'Lord God of Sabaoth, who judges righteously and tries the reins and the heart,' who can neither deceive nor be deceived, who discerns those that seek their own interests and those that seek yours.⁶⁴

The letter has overtones of the psychology which motivated the Curia in its revolt against Paschal II, but in this instance the revolt is called for in terms of a different ideal. Whereas Bruno of Segni had appealed to the *lex* of the Gregorian canonists, Bernard speaks in the name of the pietistic *lex caritatis*. Under the terms of this law, the casuistic canon is swept aside and issues are judged by the demands of the heart. Once it had become obvious to Bernard that the Curia was corrupt, allegiance to that body was summarily abolished. By 1119 it was patent to the men of the new reform orders that insidious elements controlled that body and that so long as these elements were in control, the new reform would fail.

Bernard, indeed, saw curial decadence and the decline of monasticism as merely two aspects of the one problem. For him Cluny under Pontius was the monastic equivalent of a Curia led by the radicals and the philosophical movement led by Abelard.⁶⁵ And by 1119 Bernard had an opportunity to observe how closely the Curia and Cluny were intertwined.

At the Council of Rheims, which met in 1119, Pontius was publicly accused of forcibly depriving the neighboring secular clergy of churches and tithes rightfully due them, of refusing honors due the bishop of Mâcon, and of obstructing the ordination of that bishop's clergy. Pontius did not even answer the charges. He stated that it was up to the pope to defend the order that was especially his. Speaking for the pope, John of Crema stated that Cluny was subject to the pope alone, that the pope might judge it, and reminded the clergy there assembled that violation of Cluny's ancient immunities or the attempt to oppress it with new and unusual exactions would bring down the wrath of Rome on the offenders.⁶⁶

According to Ordericus Vitalis, the criticism did not subside. It continued throughout the years 1119-1122, while Pontius was representing the pope in negotiations with Henry V.⁶⁷ Finally, in the midst of the negotiations which ultimately resulted in the Worms settlement,

Pontius resigned his abbacy and abruptly departed for the Holy Land. The abbey came under the rule of Peter the Venerable.

The fall of old style monasticism at Cluny did not halt attacks upon the older orders. The secular clergy opened an attack upon Monte Cassino in terms similar to those which had characterized the attack upon Cluny.⁶⁸ At the Council of the Lateran of 1123, Monte Cassino's luxury and power were castigated. But again Calixtus defended the old style monasticism, stating that the abbey had been founded by and was responsible to Christ alone, could be criticized by no man, and was confirmed in its ancient privileges.⁶⁹

Thus, by the end of the reign of Calixtus II there was adequate reason for the men of the new reform orders to identify old style monasticism with Gregorian radicalism in the *Curia Romana*. Combined with growing charges of corruption in the Curia itself and the stranglehold which the old guard maintained on its power, it was obvious to the new reformers that only a *coup d'état* could wrest power from the decadent elements in Rome.⁷⁰ By 1123 a small group began to form in Rome which was really an extension of the power exercised by such reformers as Hugh of Grenoble, Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable and Norbert of Magdeburg in the provinces.⁷¹ Its ultimate aim was to free the papal office from the tyranny of the Curia—an aim which was realized only in 1145 when Eugenius III ascended the pontifical throne. Between the beginning of the anti-Gregorian movement in Rome and the succession of Eugenius III lay twenty years of schism, revolution and counterrevolution in Rome. The first casualty in this revolutionary cycle was Pontius of Cluny.

III

Since Peter the Venerable states that criticism of Pontius began within his own order three years after his assumption of power,⁷² that is, in 1112, and since it is obvious that no real decline could have set in at Cluny in that short time, we must look elsewhere for the reasons for that criticism. That Peter names 1112 is significant, for it was in that year that the Curia revolted against Paschal and it is from this year that Pontius' close association with the radicals in the Curia can be dated. It seems justifiable to assume that Pontius' alliance with the Curia precipitated the division within the order of Cluny and ultimately led to Pontius' conflict with Peter the Venerable. The younger men of the order, men like Peter the Venerable and Matthew, prior of St. Martin des Champs, were from the very first devoted to St. Bernard and the monastic reform movement which he represented.⁷³ Pontius stood for old style monasticism, and he was undoubtedly the spokesman for the older men in the order who desired to maintain the reli-

gious life at Cluny in its traditional pattern.⁷⁴ Alliance with a Curia such as that which had rebelled against Paschal probably split the order down the middle on two issues: abandonment of traditional Cluniac neutrality in the Church-Empire struggle and alliance with a group which represented the aspirations of the sacerdotal hierarchy. Add to this the obvious split between the younger and older members of the order over the interpretation of the Rule and the conditions for schism at Cluny were created.

One might conclude that this division between the two generations at Cluny explains the election of Hugh of Marcigny, a saintly but senile prior, to succeed Pontius. Hugh's election smacks of a compromise between two hostile parties. His death a few months later resulted in the election of Peter the Venerable, whose reign was never marked by a spirit of unanimity in the order as a whole.⁷⁵

Peter appointed Matthew of St. Martin des Champs as his lieutenant and immediately undertook a series of reforms which had as their model the Rule as interpreted at Clairvaux. These reforms were generally regarded with disfavor throughout the order and could rightly have been interpreted as betrayals of traditional Cluniac habits. The older members of the order resented Peter's desire to vie with the Cistercians for the crown of ascetic attainment.⁷⁶ They must have constituted the bulk of Pontius' support at Cluny. In any event, certain of the priories began to argue that Pontius, not Peter, was rightful abbot of Cluny,⁷⁷ and in 1125, when Pontius found himself in Gaul, the conditions for a *coup* were too tempting to ignore.

Ordericus Vitalis insists that Pontius had no intention of seizing power at Cluny. Traveling in Gaul, he passed near Cluny and discovered that Peter the Venerable was absent on a tour of his priories in the south. He decided to visit his old friends at the abbey and they made ready to receive him in a style befitting his former rank. But the prior Bernard, whom Peter had left in charge during his absence, prohibited Pontius' friends from greeting him thus. This so angered Pontius' supporters at Cluny that a schism resulted, and when the surrounding burghers and men at arms, with whom Pontius had been a favorite, heard of this schism, they took the occasion to drive Peter's supporters from the abbey and reinstall Pontius as abbot, although Pontius himself protested against it ("licet ipse hoc noluisse"). Unfortunately, Ordericus continues, the attack got out of hand and all sorts of undesirables were introduced inside the abbey walls, but he makes no mention of the wanton destruction of the surrounding countryside of which Peter accuses Pontius.⁷⁸

Peter, of course, holds that Pontius had every intention of seizing

Cluny from the moment he left Italy. According to his account, Pontius gathered about him certain fugitives to whom he gave arms, advanced upon the abbey, forced his entry, and, "with a promiscuous crowd of armed men and even women stormed the cloisters." With threats of physical violence he forced all at Cluny to swear allegiance to him. Then, after having melted down the vessels in the sacred treasury and becoming "completely corrupted by his gold," Pontius occupied himself for a full six months with the ravaging of the countryside about Cluny.⁷⁹

In evaluating the two accounts it must be borne in mind that neither of them comes from a first hand knowledge of the events. Ordericus was in his cloister at St. Evroul at the time, while Peter the Venerable was absent from Cluny on an inspection tour.⁸⁰ It was Pontius' personal enemy, the prior Bernard, who escaped and informed Peter of the events which had transpired at Cluny, and it is this account which appears in the *De Miraculis*. On the other hand, Ordericus Vitalis had little reason to distort the facts, and he had ample opportunity to ascertain them during his visit to Cluny during the general chapter of 1132.⁸¹

The use of Peter's version of the facts may be challenged on a number of counts. In the first place, he was Pontius' personal enemy and competitor for the abbacy of Cluny. Secondly, it seems highly dubious that Pontius would lay waste the countryside whose inhabitants had re-installed him as abbot. On the other hand, if it is true, as Ordericus tells us, that he was intruded into the abbey against his will, then he would have had little to say concerning the actions of his supporters after they had begun to loot the abbey itself. Thirdly, the monks who supported Pontius do not seem to have been motivated by desire for gain, as Peter implies. They defended him in Rome before Pope Honorius II, suffered his sentence with him and died with him. Fourthly, if Pontius did not feel that he had a case, why did he present himself in Rome for trial immediately upon being summoned? All of these considerations would seem to imply that Peter's account is slanted and would seem to lead to an acceptance of the account of Ordericus Vitalis. Finally, there is one point of fact on which Peter himself is his own challenger. He states that Pontius melted down the vessels of the sacred treasury and used the gold to procure arms and men for his campaigns. Yet when Honorius II ruled in Peter's favour in 1126, one of the provisions of the decision was that Pontius' monks were to restore the sacred vessels taken from the treasury to Peter.⁸² Therefore, they could not have been melted down, as Peter maintains.

Nor did Peter have any opportunity to ascertain the facts of the case directly. Upon being informed of Pontius' *coup* by the prior Ber-

nard, Peter did not return to Cluny but immediately departed for Rome in the company of Matthew of St. Martin des Champs in order to beg the protection of Pope Honorius II.⁸³ Pontius, meanwhile, was summarily excommunicated by his old enemy, the archbishop of Lyons, the same who had attacked him at Rheims in 1119.⁸⁴ But Pontius' protector, Calixtus II, was no longer alive and his friends in the Curia, the old guard radicals, had been ousted from power in 1124 in a *coup d'état* that had installed Cistercian ideals in the papal chair in the person of Honorius II.

Calixtus died in December 1124. The Curia was divided over the choice of his successor. One faction of the College of Cardinals supported the cause of Saxo of Anagni, champion of old guard radicalism of the Calixtan variety. Another group, composed of the younger members of the Curia, led by Aimerich and informed by Cistercian ideals, favoured the candidacy of Lambert of Ostia, scion of an impoverished family of the lower nobility from near Bologna. After much dispute and bargaining which must have been not unlike that which preceded the election of Hugh of Marcigny at Cluny, a compromise candidate was selected in the person of the aged Teobaldo Boccadipeccora, who took the name Celestine II.

During the consecration of the new pope, the notorious Frangipane family, in the pay of Aimerich, stormed the electoral chamber, pulled Celestine from his improvised throne, and raised Lambert of Ostia in his stead. The old guard fled the scene and took refuge in the towers of the Pierleoni family in Trastevere. Lambert took the name Honorius II and Celestine's death, a short while afterwards, left him as sole claimant to the papal power.⁸⁵

The radicals in the Curia did not dare risk open schism with the new pope, because Henry V still lived and could have used a schism as an excuse for renouncing the Concordat of Worms and intruding himself into Roman affairs as monitor of the disputed election.⁸⁶ Furthermore, the leader of the radicals, Petrus Leo, was aged and near death, and his son, Peter Pierleoni, was absent as legate in Gaul and England. Therefore, the radicals, themselves approaching senility, were without the sort of vigorous leadership necessary to allow them to recapture the initiative.⁸⁷ But they still controlled a majority of the votes in the College of Cardinals, and they resolved to wait for Honorius' death and then make their play to recapture control of the papal office. Meanwhile, Honorius held his office illegally, through the force of Frangipane arms, although the real ruler in Rome was Aimerich, Bernard's friend and a devotee of Cistercian asceticism.⁸⁸

The meaning of the new pontificate for the reform orders was immediately made evident. St. Bernard hailed Honorius' elevation

as marking the advent of a new era in the Church.⁸⁹ Norbert of Xanten was given permission to preach his reform and formed his order at Prémontré.⁹⁰ Old guard power in Rome was systematically reduced; younger men replaced the old guard in all of the important offices in the Curia.⁹¹ The first two centers to suffer were the traditional Gregorian strongholds, Monte Cassino and Cluny. In the case of the latter, Honorius had an excuse to act promptly, for it was in the throes of schism. He had only to confirm Peter the Venerable in his office. Honorius' triumph in 1124 assured, therefore, Pontius' condemnation even before he arrived in Rome. The deposition of Oderisius II of Monte Cassino followed shortly thereafter.⁹³

The events which transpired at Rome in 1124-26 bear a striking resemblance to those which transpired at Cluny during the same period. Two parties had formed at Cluny and at Rome. In Rome one party was devoted to traditional Gregorianism and the other was devoted to the Cistercian concept of church organization and reform. At Cluny one party was devoted to traditional monasticism, while the other was informed by a more radical asceticism of the type represented by St. Bernard. The conflict between the older generation and the younger, radical one resulted in both cases in the election of a compromise candidate, in both cases an aged nonentity. The removal of the compromise candidate was followed at both Rome and Cluny by the seizure of power on the part of the younger group. These seizures of power were followed by implementation of reforms in the light of the new ideals and the systematic elimination of the older groups. In both cases schism was the result. At Cluny the leader of the schism was Pontius; at Rome the leader of the old guard in the schism of 1130-38 was Peter Pierleoni, formerly a monk at Cluny under Pontius. The victory of the younger men hinged in both cases upon the efforts of the same leadership élite: the chancellor Aimerich, Peter the Venerable, Matthew (under Honorius II created cardinal-bishop of Albano), and St. Bernard of Clairvaux. In both cases there were two different party accounts of the events which led up to the seizure of power by the new men. In the order of Cluny the two accounts were represented by the works of Peter the Venerable and Ordericus Vitalis. At Rome the two accounts were set forth in the two versions of the "Vita Honorii" of the *Liber Pontificalis* by Pandolf of Pisa. Because the Bernardines ultimately prevailed in the struggle, the real nature of Honorius' election was concealed for a long while. Only the discovery of the original version of Pandolf's "Vita" allowed the reconstruction of the true concurrence of events which prepared for the schism of 1130-38.⁹⁴ Given Pandolf's account, all of Pontius' actions, as told by Ordericus Vitalis, become not only meaningful but justifiable.

According to Pandolf, Honorius' election was followed by a schism in the College of Cardinals which lasted for the duration of Honorius' pontificate and presaged the schism of 1130.⁹⁵ The Bernardine account of Honorius' reign states that a few days after his irregular election, the pope assembled all the cardinals and offered to abdicate if they so desired, but they demanded unanimously that he retain his power, and so Honorius lived out his pontificate in an aura of peace and cooperation with his Curia.⁹⁶ Klewitz's study of Honorius' pontificate confirmed the account of Pandolf in the original version of the "*Vita Honorii*."⁹⁷ There is no doubt that Honorius' pontificate was marked by the most violent hostility between the two groups and that they often verged on open schism. It was to such a Curia that Pontius travelled in 1126 for judgment.

In all probability Pontius was not fully aware of the situation in Rome when he departed Cluny for Rome in 1126. Honorius assumed power in December 1124. At that time Pontius was either in Gaul or making ready to depart for Gaul. Upon arriving at Cluny, he found the abbey in a state of schism over the interpretation of the Rule, and he was prevailed upon to act on behalf of his friends who still considered him rightful abbot. He was probably content that should he be cited to Rome, he would be judged by his friends in the Curia there and could at least obtain the satisfaction of deposing Peter the Venerable along with himself.

If we assume his ignorance of the schism which then prevailed in Rome, we can also explain his actions upon his arrival. According to Ordericus, Pontius presented himself in Rome, but after his arrival "was in no hurry to present himself to the pope, and although summoned refused to appear and plead the charge on the appointed day. . . ." Shortly afterwards he was arrested by the pope's men-at-arms "for contempt of the apostolic authority," and committed to prison. Ordericus says nothing of a trial.⁹⁸

Peter the Venerable's account fills in the gaps in Ordericus' story. He states that Pontius created a scandal in the city by asserting that "no living mortal could excommunicate him. To (St.) Peter alone, to none other, that power belonged." Peter goes on to note that when this became known to the pope Pontius was branded schismatic as well as excommunicate, and he gives us to believe that these were the ravings of a megalomaniac.⁹⁹

But Pontius' words and actions can be perfectly well explained. After his arrival in Rome he was undoubtedly made aware of the schism which divided the Curia and of the true nature of Honorius' election. When he discovered that he would be judged, not by his old

friends in the Curia, but by men loyal to St. Bernard, he fell back upon his rights and Gregorian principles in order to defend himself.

As supposed abbot of Cluny and as a prelate who could claim cardinal rank in Rome, he could be judged only by a duly elected pope. Since, in his view, there was no duly elected pope in Rome, only St. Peter could judge him, not the pseudo-pope Honorius. His refusal to present himself before Honorius placed him in the ranks of the schismatic old guard. Pontius was taken by the pope's men and subjected to a trial at the hands of his enemies. Little wonder that Ordericus speaks of Pontius as having died "overwhelmed with the most poignant sorrow" and Pandolf, the spokesman for the old guard, mentions his death in prison without comment.¹⁰⁰ Little wonder that a tradition survived which held that Pontius was never tried at all.¹⁰¹

Since he stood under a ban of excommunication, Pontius could not be heard until after he had begged papal absolution. But to have done this would have required tacit recognition of the legitimacy of Honorius' claims to the papal power, and that Pontius adamantly refused to give. Therefore, he was never allowed to speak at his own trial, even though his condemnation was a foregone conclusion.¹⁰²

Certain of Pontius' monks made the necessary obeisance to Honorius and were allowed to plead his case for him. Their defense, if we are to believe the documents, was astonishingly simple: Pontius had never abdicated, they argued, but had merely asked for and been granted leave of absence in order to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. This allegation was refuted by Aimerich, who produced the *Regesta* of Calixtus II and read a communication from the pope to Pontius warning him never to molest Cluny, which he had surrendered into papal hands without hope of recovery, and threatening him with anathema if he ever attempted to regain his rule there. Thereupon, Matthew of St. Martin des Champs, who represented Peter the Venerable at the hearing, arose and demanded that the pope restore Peter to his rightful place at Cluny. Judgment was so given and Pontius was deprived of all honors that he still held in the Church.¹⁰³

One wonders whether Pontius' monks broached the subject of conflicting interpretations of the Rule at Cluny. Surely their claim that Pontius had never surrendered his rule at Cluny—a claim which, if untrue, could be easily disproved—was not their sole defense. One wonders further whether, had he been given an opportunity to plead his own case, Pontius would have openly denounced Honorius as usurper of Papal power and Peter the Venerable as his pawn. But these questions must go unanswered, since in the words concerning Pontius' trial that have come down to us there is little that would give us real insight into the true nature of the hearing.

There is one piece of evidence which gives one to pause, however. In the account of the trial which appears in Peter's *De Miraculis*, it is implied that Pontius' representatives were heard and judged by the *entire* Curia as well as by the clergy and nobility of Rome.¹⁰⁴ But if, as Pandolf avers, the Curia was divided in schism during Honorius' entire pontificate, it is difficult to see how he was tried by that group as a whole.

The solution to the problem probably lies in the curious concept of unanimity which informed the actions of the chancellor Aimerich throughout the pontificates of Honorius II and Innocent II. After the irregular election of Honorius in 1124, Aimerich managed to conceal that irregularity and pawn off his candidate as the choice of the entire Curia. In 1130, although his party could claim but sixteen of forty-one votes available in the College of Cardinals, Aimerich presented his candidate as unanimously elected—and he was supported in this misrepresentation by St. Bernard of Clairvaux.¹⁰⁵ If he was not above manipulating two illegal papal elections, how much less capable was he of truthfulness in helping disgrace the unpopular abbot of Cluny, Pontius? Peter the Venerable was not in Rome during the trial, so he could not have known the details of the trial.¹⁰⁶ He received his information from Honorius' chancellor, and it is undoubtedly Aimerich's account which appears in the *De Miraculis*. Does Peter's decision to remove the body of Pontius from Rome and inter it in consecrated ground at Cluny indicate a guilty conscience, the action of a man not certain that his victory was untainted? Again it is impossible to say, but knowing what we know of the practices of the new men in Rome, we are allowed to wonder.

Seen in the light of the events outlined above, it seems obvious that sufficient grounds exist for us to essay a reevaluation of Pontius or at least to question the accepted view. His story has come down to us from his enemies, from men engaged in a life and death struggle between two different ages and ideologies in the history of the Church. Only with difficulty did the new society of the twelfth century replace the violent society of the eleventh. It was inevitable that the transition from the old to the new be accompanied by conflict in those areas in which the older society had most to lose by transition—in Rome and at Cluny. Events were hastened at Cluny by that pride which informed all the actions of Pontius. Yet in his way he remained faithful to the world which gave him birth. His brother abbot, Oderisius of Monte Cassino, fell before the same zeal that destroyed Pontius, but Oderisius outlived Honorius' regime, and he was allowed the pleasure of returning to Rome in the entourage of the rebel Peter Pierleoni, who, as Anacletus II, vainly attempted from 1130 to 1138 to restore

the lost honor of the old guard.¹⁰⁷ But Pierleoni and Oderisius were doomed as certainly as was Pontius. The future belonged, at least for a while, to the new men and the ideals they represented. Theirs, therefore, was the victory, but by setting the events which led up to that victory in their proper context, some of Pontius' honor is redeemed.

1. Fliehe, in one of the latest accounts of the subject, writes: "L'ordre a eu de la peine à se remettre de la crise qui avait suivi la mort de saint Hugues et dont l'abbé Pons de Melgueil (1109-1122) est, pour une large part, responsable." A. Fliehe, R. Foreville and J. Jousset, *Du premier Concile du Latran à l'avènement d'Innocent III (1123-1198)*, volume IX of *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, edited by A. Fliehe and V. Martin (Paris, 1948), 114-15. For an account of Cluny under St. Hugh, see volume VIII of the same series, A. Fliehe, *La Réforme grégorienne et la Reconquête chrétienne* (Paris, 1950), 427-45. Literature on the Cluniac movement is cited in *ibid.*, 427, n. 2, but see especially U. Berliere, *L'ordre monastique des origines au XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1924), 251ff.; L. M. Smith, *Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (London, 1930), 237 ff.; J. Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny, 910-1157* (London, 1931), 35ff.; A. Chagny, *Cluny et son empire* (Lyon-Paris, 1949), 255ff., and finally the general histories of G. De Valous, *Le monachisme clunisien des origines au XVe siècle* (3 vols., Paris, 1935), and Ernst Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser* (2 vols., Halle, 1892-94).
2. Fliehe, Foreville, and Jousset, *op. cit.*, 114ff.; D. Knowles, "The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable," in *Petrus Venerabilis, 1156-1956: Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of his Death*, edited by G. Constable and J. Kritzeck, volume XL of *Studia Anselmiana* (Roma, 1956), 2ff., and A. H. Bredero, "The Controversy between Peter the Venerable and St. Bernard of Clairvaux," in *ibid.*, 63ff.
3. The basic research on the history of the Curia during this period was done by K. Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie," *ZRG, KA, XXVII* (1939), 105ff., and H. W. Klewitz in two important articles: "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums," *ZRG, KA, XXIV* (1936), 115-221, and "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," *DA, III* (1939), 371-412.
4. See the account of Pontius' career in *Histoire littéraire de la France* (Paris, 1869), XI, 19, and Smith, *op. cit.* 266-75.
5. "Qui primis assumptionis suae anis, satis modeste ac sobrie conversatus, procedente tempore mores mutavit, et multis ac diversis casibus vel causis, fratrum pene universorum animos exasperando, eso paulatim contra se concitavit." Peter the Venerable, *De Miraculis, P. L.*, 189:922. Bernard's attack upon Pontius' character is mounted in his first epistle, *P. L.*, 182:72ff.
6. Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica, P. L.*, 188:895.
7. It is interesting to note that to Bernard's biographers there is almost no problem in evaluating Pontius. Vacandard, for example, assumes, without any evidence whatsoever, that, in the famous case involving Robert of Chatillon's flight to Cluny and Bernard's letter to him, Robert was not shown the letter by Pontius. This opinion is cited by Williams as evidence of Pontius' devious methods. See E. Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard, Abbé de Clairvaux* (Paris, 1910), I, 98, as quoted in W. Williams, *St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (Manchester, 1935), 63.
8. Ordericus Vitalis, 843-44; Peter the Venerable, 922.
9. *Ibid.*, Ordericus Vitalis, 879.
10. Smith, 276ff.; Fliehe, 444; K. J. Conant, "Medieval Academy Excavations at Cluny," *Speculum, XXIX* (January, 1954), 1-45.
11. Pontius' role in the Gregorian movement has never been accorded its proper place. While the nature of the relation between Rome and Cluny during the Gregorian Reform period is vague, there can be no doubt that it was only under Pontius that Cluniac resources were committed openly to the papal cause. For a full discussion of the important arguments, see G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, translated by R. F. Bennet (Oxford, 1948), Appendix V, pp. 186-192.
12. Ordericus Vitalis, 879; Smith, 237-65.
13. Pandolf of Pisa, "Vita Gelasii," in *Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis*, edited by J. Marsh, S. J. (Barcelona, 1925), 177-78.

14. Falco of Beneventum, *Chronicon*, P.L., 173:1172-73; Diego of Compostella, *Historia Compostellana*, P.L., 170:1052; *Liber Pont. Dert.*, 192.
15. Smith, 277-79; U. Robert, ed., *Bul-laire du pape Calixte II, 1119-24: Es-sai de restitution* (Paris, 1891), I, 313-14, no. 214. The same document is recorded in A. Bruel, *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny* (Paris, 1894), V, 312, no. 3952.
16. Ordericus Vitalis, 894; Anselm of Gembloux, *Chronica*, P.L., 160:246-47.
17. Ordericus Vitalis, 894-95; Peter Ven-erabile, 923-26.
18. *Ibid.*, 926.
19. *Ibid.*
20. Ordericus Vitalis, 895; Honorius II, Ep. XXXXVIII, P.L., 166:1268.
21. Ordericus Vitalis, 844.
22. A. J. Toynbee, *A Study of History* (10 vols., Oxford, 1935-54), V, 23ff.
23. M. Weber, *From Max Weber, Essays in Sociology*, translated and with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (London, 1952), 246-50.
24. See the "Vita Paschalis" in L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis, Texte, introduction et commentaire* (Paris, 1886-92), II, 296, and the "Frag-mentum Tractatus Paschalis II," a document supposedly written by Pas-chal II which is hardly more than a commentary on Matthew 19:31. In this document Paschal presents pov-erty as the rule of the Church in all its orders, enjoins the hierarchy to live the "apostolic life," and admon-ishes the priest to seek for himself nothing more than food and clothing, the necessities of life. Mansi, *Concilia* (Venetiis, 1754-98), XX, 1087-88. See also W. Kratz, *Der Armutsgedanke im Entäusserungsplan des Papstes Paschalis II* (Dissertation, 1933), a work which I have not been able to see but which is cited in K. Bihlmeyer and H. Teuchle, *Storia della Chiesa*, edizione Italiana a cura di I. Rogger (Brescia, 1956), II, 184, n. 8.
25. A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutsch-lands* (3rd. ed., Leipzig, 1906), III, 900-901. There is a long castiga-tion of the mores of the clergy of the time in "Privilegium Primae Conventionis," *MGH, Const.*, I, 141. See also the remarks of Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John* (Cambridge, 1931), 29ff., where the growing demand for moral reform which marked the reign of Urban II is described. The general attitude is summarized in St. Bernard's "Epi-stola ad Sugerium," P.L., 182:191ff.
26. Fliche, 339-352; J. Heffele and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles d'apres les documents originaux*, French translation of the 2nd German edi-tion (Paris, 1912), V, i, 339-52; R. W. Carlyle and A. J. Carlyle, *A His-tory of Medieval Political Thought in the West* (Edinburgh and London, 1922), IV, 111-12; W. Schwarz, "Die Investitur in Frankreich," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLII (1923), 92ff., and I. Ott, "Der Regalienbegriff im 12. Jahr-hundert," *ZRG, KA XXXV* (1948), 239ff.
27. See Ivo of Chartres, "Epistola," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 644-45, 654, and the exchange of letters between Ivo and Urban II in P.L., 162:85-86. Com-pare the comments of Ott, 240, and A. Schnargl, *Der Begriff der Investi-tur in den Quellen und der Litera-tur des Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart, 1908), 136-37. Fliche maintains that Paschal, "loin d'adhérer aux idées nouvelles lancées à la fin du pré-cédent pontificat par Yves de Chârtres, maintenait dans toute sa rigueur la législation grégorienne." Fliche, *His-toire*, 339. But see the remarks of J. J. Juglas, "Yves de Chârtres et la question des investitures," *Mélanges Albert Dufourcq* (Paris, 1932), 59; Schwarz, *op cit.*, XLIII (1924), 140-41, and Carlyle, 111. Paschal was in constant contact with Ivo of Chartres for the first twelve years of his pon-tificate, and when he left for France to begin negotiations with the king, he stopped by Chartres and passed Easter 1107 with Ivo. See *JW*, 6129 (4557), 6130 (4557).
28. By the time of Paschal's succession, the cardinals had won the right of subscribing, that is, of appending their approval to papal acts. Yet from the year 1106, the year in which Paschal opened his campaign to set-tle the investiture struggle in his own terms, and 1112, the year in which the Curia forced him to renounce his program, there exist no *bullae mai-ores* with the cardinalate *subscrip-tiones* appended. On the rights of the cardinals vis-à-vis the popes during the reign of Urban II and Paschal II, see W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Re-lation of Clerical to Lay Power* (Lon-don, 1955), 319-25. On the cardinalate *subscripciones*, see "Die Unterschrif-ten der Päpste und Kardinäle in den "Bullae maiores" vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert," *Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle* (Roma, 1924), 185-86.
29. See the "Promissio Papa per Petrum Leonis Dicta," *MGH, Const.*, I, 138, no. 85, and the remarks of Carlyle, 116-17, 120.
30. *MGH, Const.*, I, 145.

31. This is the justification given in the "Relatio Registri Paschalis II," *MGH, Const.*, I, 149.
32. This is the underlying idea of the first important canon law collection of the reform movement, the *Diversorum Sententiae Patrum* of Humbert of Silva Candida, a work which set the type upon which most subsequent collections were modelled. The work is analyzed in P. Fournier, "Le premier manuel canonique de la réforme du XI^e siècle," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XIV (1894), 147-223, and in A. Michel, *Die Sentenzen des Kardinals Humbert, das erste Rechtsbuch der päpstliche Reform*, volume VII of *Schriften des Reichsinstitut für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*) (Stuttgart, 1943), 31-70. For a further discussion of Humbert's ideas, see A. Michel, "Die Anfänge des Kardinals Humbert bei Bischof Bruno von Toul (Leo XI)," *Studi Gregoriani*, III (1948), 299-319, and A. Michel, "Die folgenreichen Ideen des Kardinals Humbert und ihr Einfluss auf Gregors VII," *Studi Gregoriani*, I (1946), 65-92, as well as Ullmann, *Growth of Papal Government*, 265-71, and *idem*, "Cardinal Humbert and the Ecclesia Romana," *Studi Gregoriani*, VI (1952), 111-27. The influence of Humbert on later canonical collections in the pre-Gratian period is developed in Michel, *Sentenzen*, 166-ff.
33. On Henry III's ecclesiastical policy, see Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society*, Appendix I, 168-177, and Hauck, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, III, 380.
34. See Michel, *Sentenzen*, 32, n. 1, and Ullmann, "Cardinal Humbert," 111-22. On the rise of the College of Cardinals and its concept of participation in Petrine power, see Klewitz, "Entstehung," 119; M. Andrieu, "L'origine du titre de cardinal dans l'Eglise Romaine," *Miscellanea G. Mercati* (Roma, 1949), V, 135-44, and S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept," *Traditio*, III (1945), 191-94.
35. Ullmann, "Cardinal Humbert," 122; Klewitz, "Entstehung," 119ff.
36. See Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 174ff., and Klewitz, "Entstehung," 166ff. The canonical collections of Anselm of Lucca and Cardinal Deusdedit both contain the reservation on papal power and the idea of cardinalate participation in that power given by Humbert. See F. Thaner, ed., *Anselmi Collectio Canonum una cum collectione minore* (Oeniponte, 1906), xii, 12, pp. 272-73, and V. E. Von Glanvell, ed., *Die Kanonsammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905), 267-68.
37. See the discussion of the "Descriptio Sanctuarii Lateranensis Ecclesiae," Bib. Vat., Reg. MSS, 712, 89v, quoted in Klewitz, "Entstehung," 119.
38. On the Gregorian radicals, see A. Dempf, *Sacrum Imperium: Geschichte und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politischen Renaissance* (München-Berlin, 1929), 219ff.; Klewitz, "Entstehung," 216ff.; Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire*, 532-34; Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, 370ff.; U. Robert, *Histoire du pape Calixte II* (Paris, 1891), 8-19, 29-44, and B. Gigalski, *Bruno von Segni, 1049-1123: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Münster, 1898), 82ff.
39. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire*, 529.
40. Bruno of Segni, "Libellus III," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 565. See also Gigalski, *Bruno von Segni*, 82.
41. "Omnis autem qui heresim defendit hereticus est." Bruno, "Libellus I," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 563.
42. "Debeo igitur diligere te, sed plus debeo diligere illum, qui et te fecit, et me." *Ibid.*, 564.
43. See the letters of John of Tusculo and Leo of Ostia in *P.L.*, 143:290, and Placidus of Nonantola's "Liber de Honore Ecclesiae," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 637-38.
44. The document is in L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Censum de l'Eglise Romaine* (Paris, 1910), II, 136.
45. On the proposed synod at Anse, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire*, 531.
46. Ivo held that the pope's action could not be called heretical because heresy "ex fides et error ex corde procedunt. Investitura vero illa, de qua tantus ex motus, in solis est manibus datis et accipientis, quae bona et mala aegere possunt, credere vel errare in fide non possunt." Ivo of Chartres, "Epistola ad Iosceranum," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 653. He also argued that even if the pope had erred, it was not for the sheep to correct the shepherd. *Ibid.*, 652. See also Ivo's *Decretum*, *P.L.*, 161:327; the anonymous work of a French Chartrian, "Disputatio vel Defensio Paschalis Papae," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 665, in which it is argued: "Habet enim Romani pontifices suum speciale privilegium prava corrigere, recta firmare, imperfectu perficere, et illicite prohibere. Habet Romana Ecclesia privilegium, quod prima sedes non iudicatur a quoquam," and, finally, the work of the canonist Berthold, "De Incontinentia Sacerdotum," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 21.

47. Jusserand of Lyons, "Epistola ad Ivonem," *MGH, Lib.*, II 656.
48. On the synod of Vienne, see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire*, 533. The document sent by the French radicals to Paschal for approval is published in Duchesne, *Liber Censum*, II, 136.
49. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire*, 537, and Gigalski, *Bruno von Segni*, 96ff. Paschal ruled that henceforth no cleric might occupy a major abbacy and a bishopric at the same time. As a result of this ruling, Bruno of Segni resigned his abbacy of Monte Cassino. See Peter the Deacon, "Chron. Cass.," *MGH, SS*, VII, 783.
50. Paschal's attempt to abdicate is related in the fragment "Ex Historiam Pontificum et Comitum Engolismensis," M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* (Paris, 1878), XII, 394. See the discussion of the abdication attempt in W. Schum, "Kaiser Heinrich V und Paschalis II im Jahre 1112," *Jahrbücher der Königliche Akademie zu Erfurt*, VIII (1877), 221ff., and Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire*, 533.
51. Ekkehard, "Chronicon," *MGH, SS*, VI, 250-51.
52. John of Gaeta's life is given in Peter the Deacon, "De Viribus Illustrioribus Casinensibus," *P.L.*, 173: 1046. His role in the development of curial power is discussed by K. Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie," *ZRG, KA*, XXVII (1939), 107-110 and Kuttner, "Cardinalis," 197. See also R. L. Poole, *The Papal Chancery* (Cambridge, 1915), 84ff. Guy of Vienne was elected by at most six cardinals, the majority of the College of Cardinals having remained in Rome when Gelasius II fled the city for Cluny. See "Annales Romani," in Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, II, 344-48, and Pandolf's "Vita Gelasii," in Marsh, *Lib. Pont. Dert.*, 176-77, as well as Ordericus Vitalis, 849. On the importance of Guy of Vienne's election as symbolic of Clunian supremacy in the Curia, see E. Caspar, "Bernhard von Clairvaux," in *Meister der Politik: Eine Weltgeschichtliche Reihe von Bildnissen*, edited by E. Marcks and K. von Müller (Berlin, 1923), 184, and K. Hampe, *Das Hochmittelalter: Geschichte des Abendlandes von 900 bis 1250* (Münster-Köln, 1953), 179.
53. See the events related in "Chartulario Ecclesiae Gratianopolitanae," *P.L.*, 166:1567, and in Guignois, "Vita Hugonis," *P.L.*, 163:447.
54. See the references to the literature on the Concordat of Worms in B. Gebhardt, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte*, herausgegeben von H. Grundmann (8th. ed., Stuttgart, 1954), I, 278-79, and the remarks of Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, 378, and Robert, *Histoire du pape Calixte II*, 19.
55. Mansi, XXI, 270.
56. *Ibid.*, 268, which cites Calixtus' ruling that monks may not visit the sick, publicly celebrate mass, or administer extreme unction. This was in keeping with the sacerdotal orientation of the reform from its earliest days. See Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society*, 47, and A. Königer, *Burkhard von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit* (München, 1905), 112ff. Also C. Dereine, in his "La probleme de la vie canoniale chez les canonistes d'Anselme de Lucques à Gratien," *Studi Gregoriani*, III (1948), 287-98, comments on the conflict between secular and regular clergy during the Gregorian period. On Cluny's position under Calixtus, see Smith, 256-65; on Monte Cassino, see H. W. Klewitz, "Monte Cassino und Rom," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XXXVIII (1937-38), 36-47.
57. "Vita Norberti," *P.L.*, 170:1284-86.
58. Pandolf of Pisa, "Vita Calixti," in March, *Lib. Pont. Dert.*, 195. See also G. Ladner, "I mosaici e gli affreschi ecclesiastico-politici nell'antico Palazzo Lateranense," *Rivista dell'archeologia Christiana*, XII (1935), 270-79, and M. Armellini, *Le chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX* (Roma, 1942), II, 737-40. St. Bernard's ideas on church ornamentation and decoration are developed in his *Apologia*, *P.L.*, 182:911-16. For a discussion of this document, see W. Weisbach, *Religiöse Reform und mittelalterliche Kunst* (Zurich, 1945), 67ff.
59. It is interesting to note that in all of St. Bernard's writings there is not a single mention of Gregory VII, a fact which might indicate a certain antipathy to Gregory's ideals. Yet Fliche, *Du premier concile du Latran*, 23; Ullmann, *Growth of Papal Government*, 413ff., and Williams, *St. Bernard*, 249, all maintain that St. Bernard's ideals are a direct extension of those which dominated the great reforming pope. It is my conviction that St. Bernard was directly opposed to Gregorian ideals as those ideals were represented by the last generation of the Gregorian movement, that is, by the Gregorians in the Curia. It will be recalled that in the imperial propaganda of the time—a propaganda which had its strength in the monasteries—Gregory

- VII was consistently portrayed as "falsus monachus," perpetrator of the war between Church and State, and pervertor of monasticism itself. There is no reason to assume that Bernard was critical of this tradition; in fact, his attack against a Curia which styled itself Gregory's heir would seem to indicate the opposite. On the imperial picture of Gregory VII, see "Liber de Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda," *MGH, Lib.*, II, 214, 274-76; Guido of Ferrara, "De Schismate Hildebrandi," *MGH, Lib.*, I, 535; Peter Crassus, "Defensio Heinrici Regis," *MGH, Lib.*, I, 434-450.
60. St. Bernard, Ep. I, *P.L.*, 182:73-74. On the nature of the letter itself, see A. H. Bredero, "The Controversy between Peter the Venerable and St. Bernard," 60, n. 24.
 61. "Quomodo ergo vel abbatis iussio, vel Papae permissio licitum valuit quod purum (sicut irrefutabiliter probatum est) malum fuit, cum superius nihilominus allegatum sit, ea quae huiusmodi sunt, id est pura mala, ut nunquam iuste iuberi, sic nec licite fieri?" Bernard, Ep. VII, *P.L.*, 182:98-9. See also Ep. IV, *P.L.*, 182:89-91, 94-95.
 62. For example, Bernard had written to Innocent II on one occasion: "Quis mihi faciet iustitiam de vobis? Si haberem ad quem vos trahere possem, jam nunc ostenderem vobis (ut perturbans loquor) quid meremini. Exstat quidem tribunal Christi: sed absit ut ad illud appellem vos, qui illic (si vobis necessarium, et mihi possibile esset) vellem magis totis viribus stare, et respondere pro vobis." Bernard, Ep. CCXIII, *P.L.*, 182:378.
 63. In the *De Consideratione* Bernard argued that the union of exalted rank with a base spirit was a monstrosity, as was the joining together of the supreme seat with the lowest life, and added: "Quid si summus pontifex sis? Numquid quia summus pontifex, ideo summus? Infimum noris esse, si summum putas. Quis summus? Cui addi non possit. Gravier erras, si te illum existimes. Absit. Non tu de illis es qui dignitates virtutes putant." *P.L.*, 182:750. The *De Consideratione* was written to Eugenius III in order "to please, to edify and to console" him. Its aim is to translate monastic-ascetic ideals into terms suitable for the direction of the entire Church. But Bernard's relation to Eugenius was that of friend and teacher to pupil. Earlier popes he had chastised with a heavier hand. In 1130, for example, he had effected the victory of Innocent II over the anti-pope Anacletus II, even though Anacletus' election was supported by a majority of the College of Cardinals. See his well intentioned but specious arguments on behalf of Innocent in his Ep. CXXVI, *P.L.*, 276-80. In 1139 he criticized the episcopacy and the Roman Curia again. See Ep. CLXXVIII, *P.L.*, 182:340; Ep. CXCIII, *ibid.*, 359; CCCXXXVII, *ibid.*, 541. See finally the remarks of F. Heer, *Aufgang Europas: Eine Studie zu den Zusammenhängen zwischen politischer Religiosität, Frömmigkeitsstil und dem Werden Europas im 12. Jahrhundert* (Wien-Zürich, 1949), 197ff.
 64. "Veniet, veniet qui male iudicata reindicabit, illicite iurata confutabit; qui faciet iudicium iniuriam patientibus, qui indicabit in iustitia paupere, et arguet in aequitate pro mansuetis terrae... Veniet, inquam, veniet dies iudicii: ubi plus valebunt pura corda, quam astuta verba; et conscientia bona, quam marsupia plena: quandoquidem Iudex ille nec fallatur verbis, nec flectetur donis. Tuum, Domine Iesu, tribunal appello: tuo me iudicio servo, tibi committo causam meam, Domine Deus sabaoth, qui iudicas iuste, et probas renes et corda; cuius oculi sicut fallere nolunt, ita falli non possunt; tu vides qui tua, vides qui quaerunt et sua." Bernard, Ep. I, *P.L.*, 182:74.
 65. That Bernard considered curialism, the Anacletan schism and the philosophical movement of which Abelard was leader as having been cut from the same cloth can be seen from references made to them in his letters. For example, Abelard and the Curia are identified in Ep. CXCIII, *P.L.*, 182:559-60; Abelard is connected with the decline of monasticism in Ep. CCCXXXI, *ibid.*, 359-360; and finally, Abelard is identified with the cause of Anacletus II, the leader of the old guard in the Curia, in Ep. CLXXXIX, *ibid.*, 354.
 66. Ordericus Vitalis, 879.
 67. *Ibid.*, 894.
 68. On the revolutionary character of Cistercian theories of institutional organization of all kinds, see G. Schreiber, *Kurie und Kloster im 12. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1910), I, 297-303; 'K. Hallinger, *Gorz-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen in hoch Mittelalter* (Roma, 1952), II, 738; Hampe, *Hochmittelalter*, 180, and J. P. Mahn, *L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement des origines au milieu du XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1945), 178-86.
 69. Peter the Deacon, "Chron. Cass.," *MGH, SS*, VII, 802.
 70. Ivo of Chartres had commented on

- the growing corruption in the Curia during his own lifetime in Ep. CXX-XIII, *P.L.*, 162:142. See also the remarks of Jordan, "Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," *Quellen und Forschungen*, XXV (1933-34), 65.
71. On the growth of the Cistercian party in the Curia, see H. Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino," *Traditio*, VIII (1952), 174, and H. Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 383ff.
 72. Peter the Venerable, 922.
 73. On the influence of Bernard upon Cluniac reform movements in the twelfth century, see Knowles, "The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable," 2-5, and Bredero, "The Controversy between Peter the Venerable and St. Bernard," 54-66, 70-71. On Matthew of St. Martin des Champs, see J. Brixius, *Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130 bis 1181* (Dissertation, Berlin, 1912), 36. In the sources Matthew is always cited for his reforming zeal. See, for example, Peter the Venerable, 921ff.
 74. Ordericus Vitalis, 935-36.
 75. Ordericus Vitalis, 894.
 76. Knowles, "The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable," 2.
 77. See Robert, *Bullaire du Calixte II*, II, 72-73, no. 319.
 78. Ordericus Vitalis, 895.
 79. Peter the Venerable, 924.
 80. *Ibid.*, 923.
 81. Ordericus Vitalis, 934ff.
 82. Peter the Venerable, 925.
 83. Ordericus Vitalis, 895.
 84. Peter the Venerable, 924.
 85. Pandolf of Pisa, "Vita Honorii," in Marsh, *Liber Pont. Dert.*, 204. See also the definitive study by Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," 371-403.
 86. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, 389.
 87. The old guard dated from the era of Paschal II for the most part. See Klewitz, "Das Ende," 375ff. On the role of the Pierleoni family in papal affairs from Gregory VII to Honorius II, see D. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierleoni in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century," *Traditio*, VIII (1953), 160ff., and P. Fedele, "Le famiglie di Anacleto II e di Gelasio II," *Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXVII (1904), 411ff. On Peter Pierleoni's legateship, see T. Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Verträge von Meerssen bis zum Schisma von 1130* (Berlin, 1935), 214, and H. Tillman, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas (1218)* (Dissertation, Bonn, 1926), 26.
 88. Klewitz, "Das Ende," 403, and F. Palumbo, *Lo scisma del MCXXX* (Roma, 1942), 154ff.
 89. Bernard, Ep. XIII, *P.L.*, 182:116-17.
 90. Honorius II, Ep. XXXVII, *P.L.*, 166:1249, and "Vita Norberti," *P.L.*, 170:1323.
 91. For example, legates appointed by Calixtus II were replaced by men loyal to the new party in Rome. See Tillman, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England*, 24-27, and Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich*, 225-29. On changes in the Curia itself, see Klewitz, "Das Ende," 373ff.
 92. Mansi, XII, 91-92, 1367-73, 1392-94.
 93. Abbot Oderisius had been a monk at Monte Cassino before entering Paschal II's service. He had been created cardinal in 1116 and elected abbot of Monte Cassino in 1123. For an account of his career, see Brixius, *Die Mitglieder*, 37. Peter the Deacon recounts the story of his dispute with Honorius II, a dispute which, if we may believe Peter, was forced by the pope. See "Chron. Cass.," *MGH*, SS, VII, 783ff.
 94. Joseph Marsh discovered the uncorrupted MS of the "Vita Honorii" in the archives at Tortosa in 1914. He published his findings in the preface to *Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis*, 7ff. The account of Honorius' reign published in Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, was doctored by one Petrus William, a partisan of Innocent II in the schism of 1130-38, who desired to mask the fact that the schism really began with Honorius' irregular election in 1124.
 95. Pandolf, "Vita Honorii," *Liber Pont. Dert.*, 205.
 96. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, II, 379.
 97. Klewitz, "Das Ende," 372.
 98. Ordericus Vitalis, 895.
 99. Peter the Venerable, 925.
 100. Ordericus Vitalis, 895; Pandolf of Pisa, "Vita Honorii," *Liber Pontificalis Dertuensis*, 207.
 101. Geoffrey of Vigeois, "Chronicon," *P.L.*, 166:840.
 102. Peter the Venerable, 925.
 103. *Ibid.*
 104. "Surgit statim auditis partibus papa, et tota Romana curia sibi adjuncta, ad rem examinandam in partem secedit." Peter the Venerable, 925; Honorius II, Ep. XLVIII, *P.L.*, 166:1267.
 105. See Innocent II, Ep. V, *P.L.*, 179:56; Ernald, "Vita Prima," *P.L.*, 185:268; Diego of Compostella, *Historia Compostellana*, in Watterich, *Vitae*, II, 187-88.
 106. Ordericus Vitalis, 895; Honorius II, Ep. XLVIII, *P.L.*, 166:1267, and Ep. IV, *ibid.*, 1272.
 107. Brixius, *Die Mitglieder*, 37.

THE POLITICAL RESISTANCE OF THE CALVINISTS IN FRANCE AND THE LOW COUNTRIES*

ROBERT M. KINGDON, *State University of Iowa*

It seems to me that much can be learned by comparative studies of the histories of the several European countries, and that this is particularly true of their political histories during the sixteenth century. A stimulating start in this direction was made by H. G. Koenigsberger in an article in *The Journal of Modern History*, titled "The Organization of Revolutionary Parties in France and the Netherlands during the Sixteenth Century."¹ I would like to propose a further exploration of some of the interesting leads presented by Mr. Koenigsberger. For the present, however, I shall avoid attempting to survey the whole field he opens up for us. I shall limit myself to a study of the revolutionary Calvinist parties, and devote most of my attention to the period of their formation.

It was the religious issue which made these parties possible, Mr. Koenigsberger justly observes, and it was "religious organizations from which developed the organization of political parties or which provided the prototype for party organization."² Accordingly, one needs to study carefully these religious organizations. That is the first lead which I would propose following.

Material for a study of Calvinist religious organization fortunately still survives in the Geneva State Archives. I have had the opportunity to do some work in these records; others have done even more work and published their findings in books which deserve attention.³ These records reveal much of the process by which, in each country, before war began, a flexible but highly disciplined network of Calvinist churches was established, under the direction of the Geneva Company of Pastors. Men sent from Geneva manned these networks to a great extent. They occupied key positions of leadership in them to an even greater extent. These missionaries had originally come to Geneva, as students or refugees, to worship God as they saw fit and to learn of the full meaning of their faith. A significant proportion of them studied with Calvin, Beza, and other theologians of Geneva; many of them also served as pastors in minor Swiss charges, and thus gained experience and an even closer acquaintance with the men who then dominated

*This article was originally prepared for reading at the joint meeting of the American Historical Association, the American Society for Reformation Research, and the American Society of Church History, on December 28, 1957, in New York. While preparing it, I benefited from the advice of Dr. Hans Baron of the Newberry Library, my colleague Prof. J. F. Gilliam, Prof. Garrett Mattingly of Columbia University, and Mr. J. J. Woltjer of the University of Leiden. Some of the materials on which it is based were gathered in Europe during a research trip financed by a grant from the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society.

Reformed Protestant thinking. At some point in this apprenticeship, it was common for the Geneva Company of Pastors to examine these men formally, in order to determine their competence and orthodoxy. They were normally sent back to France or the Low Countries only after a formal request from a congregation provided evidence that they were needed and would be both welcomed and protected. They were normally sent with a formal written testimonial, signed by the leaders of the Genevan church.⁴ These procedures first take definite shape in 1555, when the first pastor was formally dispatched to France. Two years later, in 1557, the Geneva Company of Pastors made its first formal placement of a pastor in a pulpit in the Low Countries.⁵

Such procedures obviously made it possible for Calvin and his aides to exercise a considerable authority over the Protestant evangelistic campaign. Their control was extended even further, however, partly by the creation of a church organization, partly by Geneva's continuing surveillance of the missionary pastors. The church organization consisted of a hierarchy of synods. Each local church had its own consistory, and, if big enough, its own company of pastors. Each local region had a colloquy or "classe" of pastors, each province a representative synod, and the system was capped by national synods, formed first for France in 1559, in Paris; formed first for the Low Countries in 1571, in Emden.⁶ Particularly in the beginning, however, synods could not meet frequently enough, or count on wide enough representation, to govern church affairs systematically. Partly for this reason, and partly because of the substantial prestige of its theologians, Geneva was continually consulted on all kinds of theological and ecclesiastical problems, and even, occasionally, on political problems—by individuals, by local churches, by colloquies, and by synods. The advice of Geneva was always directed at maintaining the ideological and organizational unity of the church it had created. Many of its counsels were aimed at keeping out of the church organization such radical "deviationists" as Anabaptists and Libertines. These suggestions were always listened to with respect, and usually followed.

Geography and linguistic differences probably prevented Geneva's influence from being as strong in the Low Countries as it was in France. Dutch Protestants could also turn for guidance to other centers, nearer home. The church of Emden, from the time of its foundation by John à Lasco, was important in guiding the destinies of Protestantism in the Low Countries. The Dutch churches in London and Cologne played important, if lesser, roles.⁷ More Protestant students from the Low Countries went to Heidelberg than to any other single university.⁸ Still, the popularity of Calvinist theology, and the prestige of the men sent from Geneva, seem to be enough to justify Beza's

proud boast—that the school of Geneva was the “nursery-garden of the ministers of France, . . . of England . . . (and) of Flanders.”⁹

The church organizations thus created by Geneva proved to be most useful when the time came when political revolt seemed necessary and possible. That time came very soon. In 1560 and 1561, in the years immediately following the calling of the first French national synod, local synods in south-western France began mustering troops, using colloquies and local churches as the recruiting units.¹⁰ The spread of this practice over France helps to explain the size of the army gathered under Condé's command in 1562 when revolt finally became open, and the speed with which it assembled. In the Low Countries the church organizations were even more ambitious. The united consistories, meeting in Antwerp in 1566, before the formation of a national synod, but following at least three years of regular meetings of provincial synods in Flanders and Brabant, made provisions for the creation of an entire military general staff.¹¹ It was to be headed by the Prince of Orange, if possible. Failing his consent, Horne and Brederode together, or one or the other of them, were to be offered the command. Under the commander, six gentlemen were to be appointed by the churches to serve as a council. Joined to them were to be six merchants appointed to raise funds for the army of revolt. The subsequent failure of this plan demonstrated the tenacity and strength of Spanish rule; but the very fact that it was proposed must have made it increasingly clear to leaders of undecided religious affiliation, that here was an organization admirably suited to political revolution, no matter what one thought of its theology.

The Calvinist churches had more to offer to these revolutionary parties, however, than just a useful organization. They also offered an important kind of leadership. Supreme leadership of any enterprise that hoped for political success in the sixteenth century really had to come from the high nobility. Only they possessed the experience, the training, and the resources to act effectively in the political arena; only they commanded enough respect from people generally, to serve as real leaders. Every attempt at peasant or burgher action failed, with practically no exceptions. Koenigsberger, in company with most of the historians of the period, has therefore rightly emphasized the leading role played in these revolts by Condé, a prince of the French royal blood, and William, prince of Orange. Both of these men became Calvinist—Condé sooner, William later. Neither was exactly fanatic or even particularly devout in his Calvinism. Both were directly linked to the Calvinist church organization, however, not by some theoretical Machiavellian calculation, but by the actual presence on their staffs of men who were devoted Calvinists. It is the character

and activity of these secondary leaders which supplies a second lead I think it important to explore.

The two outstanding examples of these secondary leaders were Theodore Beza and Philippe Marnix van Sint Aldegonde. Both men were noble, both received Calvinist training in Geneva. They were therefore personally well suited to act as links between church and prince. Beza came from a minor noble house established near Vézelay in Burgundy.¹² He had had a nobleman's education in the liberal arts at the usual variety of universities, and in the process apparently acquired the graces expected of a sixteenth-century gentleman. Before his education was finished he had been converted to Calvinism, and fled France, abandoning many of his titles, incomes, and perquisites in the process. In Switzerland, where he sought refuge, he became a Reformed minister of the Gospel, quickly won recognition for his great gifts of character and intellect, and rapidly rose to a position second only to that of Calvin in the Genevan church.

Marnix came from a minor noble house of Brabant.¹³ He and his brother took an even more extensive tour of universities in acquiring their education than had Beza. This tour brought them to the newly established University of Geneva at a time when Calvin and Beza were teaching there, probably in 1560. The Marnix brothers became thoroughly attached to the Calvinist cause, and soon returned to their native country to aid in its propagation. Neither became a pastor, yet both devoted much of their time and energy to the spread of Calvinism.

Beza and Marnix won the respect of the Calvinist congregations by their intellectual contributions to the elaboration and spread of the new faith. Both wrote extensively, in Latin and in the vernacular languages of the people to whom they were addressing themselves. Beza's translation of the Psalms into French became one of the most popular and important books of devotion among French Calvinists,¹⁴ and remains so to this day. Marnix's translations of the Psalms into Dutch¹⁵ filled something of the same function among Calvinists in the Low Countries, though they had to face the competition of the earlier translations of Dathenus. Both men were master polemicists. Marnix's *Bijenkorf* (Beehive), and his French revision of that work, the *Tableau des Différands de la Religion*, are among the most effective and biting bits of anti-papal satire written in any country during the Reformation.¹⁶ None of Beza's many anti-papal pamphlets won the enduring fame that did Marnix's.¹⁷ Both men also directed their polemical fire against Protestantism's radical left wing. One of Beza's first polemic writings was a reply to Castellion, in which he defended the use of persecution against heretics of the type of Servetus.¹⁸ One of Marnix's

last publications was an attack on the Dutch libertine "fanatics," which attempts to persuade ruling powers to persecute them.¹⁹ Finally, both men published important contributions to theology, in the form both of Biblical commentary and of dogmatic exposition.²⁰ Beza's theology was of course more sophisticated and authoritative, since he was the professional theologian. But Marnix's must have played a part in popularizing Calvinist orthodoxy in the Low Countries. Calvinist orthodoxy, of course, marked both these men. Throughout their lives they remained devoted to the doctrine taught by their common teacher, John Calvin. Beza, in fact, refined and systematized the doctrine to the point where some think it became more Calvinistic than Calvin's own version.

It was probably talents of a different order, however, which won for these men the respect of the military chiefs of the revolutionary parties which they joined, and which made them so useful to these commanders. Both Beza and Marnix displayed considerable ability as diplomats and negotiators. Beza first had a chance to display these talents when Calvin sent him, with others, to Germany, in 1557, on embassies to the Protestant German cities and princes, to secure intercession at the French court for the Waldensians and for a number of Protestant political prisoners. The intercessory embassies they sought were formed and sent to Paris, but were not particularly successful in their missions.²¹ Three years later Beza was approached in Geneva by the young hot-heads who, with Condé's approval, were hatching the daring plot to capture the king and kill the regents, known as the Conspiracy of Amboise. Beza seems to have given considerable encouragement to the plotters, cordially visiting their chief, giving him a copy of his translation of a psalm with a warlike point which was then used to recruit more conspirators, and sending to Paris, in the baggage of a young Calvinist noble minister, a copy of a pamphlet which was to be distributed as justification for the Conspiracy after its success.²² This plan failed miserably, but Beza's part in it was so well hidden, that his usefulness to Bourbon diplomacy was by no means over. He was soon summoned to the court of Navarre, where another plot was hatched which fell even further short of success than the first.²³ We know nothing about the planning of this plot, so cannot say what Beza's role in it might have been. His presence at the court at that time, however, looks suspicious. He left the court of Navarre when Condé was summoned north to Paris to trial and imprisonment. But when death of the king and the rise to power of Catherine de Medicis as regent gave Condé freedom again, Beza returned to France, this time at the invitation of the royal court, to head a delegation of Calvinist ministers called to debate with the leading Catholic clergy of the realm, at the Colloquy of Poissy. At Poissy Beza presented the Calvinist case with

eloquence, took advantage of the opportunity to make conversions among the courtiers, and by his public preaching did his best to strengthen the congregation of the Reformed in Paris which until this time had met in secrecy.²⁴ When war finally came, Beza was still at Condé's side.²⁵ He sent out mustering orders to the churches before hostilities began, probably prepared the published justifications of revolts which were issued over Condé's name, and seems to have assumed certain financial duties as well. Soon he was sent as Condé's ambassador to certain of the German princes and the Swiss cantons, to negotiate for financial and military assistance.

Beza, however, did not agree with all of Condé's decisions, and tried to dissuade him from several of them. He grew weary of his political chores and kept at them only because his fellow ministers in the Geneva church insisted upon it. When the first war of religion finally ended, he returned to Geneva to become shortly, on Calvin's death, its ecclesiastical leader. The duties of this new position kept him from engaging too actively in succeeding diplomatic campaigns. He did go to Germany in 1574, at the request of the new Prince of Condé, to help conclude the negotiations that made possible a renewed Protestant attack on the French crown.²⁶ And he made several trips to France on ecclesiastical business. But most of the time his political role was limited to advice and exhortation from afar.

Marnix, on the other hand, devoted most of his career to diplomatic work for the Calvinist cause.²⁷ He, like Beza, was implicated at an early stage in a conspiracy against repressive Catholic rule. He and his brother were involved in the plot which issued in the *Compromis des Nobles* of 1565, the first sign of open resistance in the Low Countries, a document announcing the intent of a small group of nobles to resist application of decrees establishing the Inquisition in full force.²⁸ The *Compromis* was soon followed by an armed uprising led by Jean Marnix de Thoulouze, which was quickly crushed by Spanish troops, partly because of Orange's failure to cooperate. It ended in the death of Jean.

Marnix van Sint Aldegonde, however, reappears at the next crucial stage in the revolt, this time at the side of the Prince of Orange. His summons by Orange in 1568 is one of the first signs of Orange's decision to use the Calvinist party as a popular base for his revolt against Spain. From that time on Marnix served Orange faithfully—too faithfully, many devoted Calvinists thought. He pleaded Orange's cause at the imperial diet, negotiated Orange's alliance with the Duc d'Anjou, became Orange's regent as burghmaster of Antwerp.

Even after the prince's death robbed Marnix of a patron, and his surrender of Antwerp to Parma left him in disgrace with the zealous Calvinists of Zealand and Holland, he came back to render diplomatic

aid to the cause of Calvinism and the Seven Provinces, representing them at the courts of Henry of Navarre and Elizabeth I.

Other leaders trained in Geneva served these revolutionary parties in similar ways, but I shall pass them by. What I have said of the activities of Beza and Marnix should provide at least some notion of the extent and importance of the secondary leadership Calvinism supplied to sixteenth-century revolt.

Yet a third Calvinist contribution to the revolutionary parties of France and the Low Countries deserves comparative study, although on this subject Koenigsberger has little to say. That is the theory Calvinist thinkers developed to justify these revolts.

The Calvinist theory of the right of resistance derives in part from theology, in part from a cursory reading of history.²⁹ It is the creation in part of theologians, in part of Calvinist lay lawyers such as Francis Hotman. Because of its partial derivation from theology, statements of it must be sought not only in the explicitly political pamphlets many Calvinist leaders wrote, but also in theological polemics and even in straight theological studies. Many scholars have noted Calvin's own statement of a resistance theory in the concluding pages of each edition of his monumental *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, beginning with the 1541 edition.³⁰ Elsewhere I have pointed out that a similar cursory statement of a resistance theory can be found in Theodore Beza's *De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis*.³¹

The subordination of Calvinist political thought to theology means that it takes many forms. Different writers, and often the same writer in different circumstances, advocated very different forms of government, and presented very different doctrines of the duty of political obedience. One can find Calvinist writers during the sixteenth century defending every form of government from absolute monarchy to democracy. The normal situation of the Calvinists, however, who could hope to find freedom for their form of worship only in alliance with revolutionary political parties led by high nobility, suggested one sort of political theory more than any other. This was a theory which emphasized the role of the "inferior magistrate" in government. The "inferior magistrates" shared with the supreme rulers the prime duty of all government—the maintenance of the "true" religion. When the supreme magistrates failed in this duty, and worse, tried to wipe out the "true religion," the inferior magistrates were allowed to resist their superiors, with force if necessary. This constituted a right of resistance but not a duty of resistance, and foolhardy plots to overthrow government were often rejected by Calvinist ministers when they were obviously impractical and had little hope of success.³² The Pauline injunction of obedience to the "powers that be (which) are ordained of

God," (Romans 13:1) continues in most Calvinist theory, but is held to apply only to private individuals, not to inferior magistrates.

When it came to define precisely who the "inferior magistrates" were, another practical problem posed itself, but Calvinist thinkers were resourceful enough to think of many answers. The "inferior magistrates" might be representatives of the Kingdom meeting in the Estates-General, with powers similar to the Ephors of ancient Sparta—so Calvin. They might be princes of the royal blood, like the Bourbons in France—so Calvin again. They might be city magistrates—so Beza. And yet other possibilities also suggested themselves.

Running through these theories of resistance I have discovered one thread, which I would now like to follow. It illustrates, I think, not only the need for careful study of the attribution of many of these ideas, but also the need for a study that investigates developments in many different countries. That thread is supplied by the example of the city of Magdeburg. One finds it cropping up again and again at crucial points.

In 1524, the imperial city of Magdeburg in Germany had been reformed in the Lutheran fashion, without the consent of its temporal ruler, the Archbishop. In 1548, Magdeburg had taken the lead in North German armed defiance of the "Interim," enacted by the Emperor and Electors of the Holy Roman Empire to suppress Protestantism wherever it had become established in the Germanies. In each instance, the elected councillors and hundred-men of the city, pushed by popular clamor, had defied constituted superior authority. Here was a dramatic example of armed resistance, led by inferior magistrates against regularly constituted higher authority, and it captured the Calvinist imagination. The example of the city's defiance was reinforced and publicized by several pamphlets, the most significant of which was written by the principal Lutheran ministers of the city, titled the Magdeburg *Bekentnis*, and published in 1550.³³ Many of the Calvinist leaders saw it, and when the time came, they found its arguments most useful.

Beza noted the Magdeburg example in passing, in his polemic against Castellion, in a passage which is apparently his first public statement of a resistance theory.³⁴ He returned to the Magdeburg example with even more vigor in the avowedly political pamphlet he wrote in 1574, after the St. Bartholomew's massacre. This event had finally persuaded the Huguenots to abandon all pretense of fighting to rescue the king from wicked councillors, and to avow openly the fact that the battle they had been waging for a decade was in resistance to the legitimate superior authority of the crown. This second pamphlet was published anonymously, without indication of place of printing or name of publisher. There is decisive archival proof, however, that

Beza wrote it.³⁵ In the very wording of his title, Beza deliberately links his arguments to that of the Magdeburg *Bekennntnis*. The title declares the book to be "published by those of Magdeburg in the year 1550, and now revised and augmented."³⁶

By these publications, Beza outlined the theory upon which he himself acted while in France, and which he presented to French Huguenots as the justification for their continued resistance.

Now let us turn to the Low Countries to see the influence of Magdeburg there. An early hint of such an influence can be found in a letter written on February 27, 1566, to the younger brother of the Prince of Orange, Louis of Nassau, at that time apparently in Germany. This letter outlines some of the violent plans of a group of impetuous young noblemen who had gathered in Breda, reports on the spread of the Inquisition which was driving them to action, and finally begs Louis to bring back with him, a "treatise which you promised us, touching the causes for which the inferior Magistrate can take arms when the superior sleeps or tyrannizes."³⁷ Two of the historians who have noted this letter believe the pamphlet referred to is one of the Magdeburg manifestoes,³⁸ and indeed that seems highly probable. The most systematic expositions of this theory had not yet been published, and the earlier statements of it by Knox, Goodman, and Ponet would probably not have been as readily available to a Dutch nobleman travelling through Germany as the Magdeburg *Bekennntnis*, or perhaps one of lesser pamphlets which accompanied it.

That some statement of the resistance theory was actually received by Dutch Calvinists is suggested by the records of the meeting of the united consistories in Antwerp on December 1, 1566, to which I have already referred. There the question was raised,

If in the Low Countries a part of the vassals with a part of the subjects can resist by force of arms against their magistrate in case that he breaks and does not observe the privileges, making some wrong or open violence? To which it was advised and resolved that it is licit to do this if one finds good means to execute it.³⁹

The consistories, as already noted, immediately proceeded to the finding of "good means," though the disastrous results of the plot must make us question their judgment.

Immediate failure, and the consequent death or exile of most of these plotters, did not kill theories of resistance in the Low Countries, however. We find them in the air again in the 1570's, when, at the initiative of the Sea-Beggars, and under the leadership of Orange, the revolt finally succeeded in maintaining itself. Specifically, in the years when the States-General was preparing for the final open denial of the authority of Philip II, which was made formal by the Placard of

Abjuration in 1581, a Calvinist theory of resistance again raises its head.

John of Nassau, another younger brother of William of Orange, who, like Louis, was a resolute Calvinist, reveals this in a letter to the Duke of Brunswick drafted in March, 1577. A postscript to the letter announces the dispatch of a set of books which he thought Brunswick would find useful. It includes a copy of Machiavelli's *Prince*, an attack on Machiavelli, and the *De jure magistratuum in subditos*, Beza's anonymous exposition of resistance theory.⁴⁰ Conceivably these books could have all been in one binding. Machiavelli and Beza were paradoxically included within the same covers in at least one printing.⁴¹

Yet another piece of evidence that John of Nassau knew of the Calvinist theory of resistance can be found in a letter in which he asks for advice on the religious policy to follow in the newly conquered province of Gelderland, just put under his control.⁴² Specifically, he asks whether he should follow the precedents of Holland, Zealand, Magdeburg, or Strasbourg, in suppressing "idolatry" and permitting only one form of religious worship. The answer, interestingly, comes not from the Dutch Calvinists to whom he wrote, but in a general letter written to the Reformed church of the Low Countries from the Geneva Company of Pastors, and signed by Theodore Beza.⁴³ It advises the Dutch to follow any example but that of Strasbourg, which weakly knuckled under to the imperial *Interim*, and permitted re-introduction of "false" religion. Here the magistrates of Magdeburg are held up, not as exemplars of legitimate resistance, but as defenders of the only true faith. This was taken to be the ultimate duty of all government, and that which we have seen is the only justification for resistance.

Finally, in the *Apology of the Prince of Orange* against the King of Spain, presented to the States-General at the time of the adoption of the Placard of Abjuration, one finds echoes of the Calvinist theory of resistance. Specifically, one finds it in Orange's statement that it is for the great vassals of the realm

to stand our Dukes in that steede, that the Ephori at Sparta did their Kinges, that is to say, to keepe the kingdome sure, in the power of a good Prince, and to cause him to yeelde equitie, which stood against his othe.⁴⁴

The sentiment expressed here could easily have come from a reading of Calvin.⁴⁵ The reference to the Ephors of Sparta certainly suggests that. This time there is no reference to Magdeburg.

Magdeburg, of course, was not the only inspiration for the Calvinist theory of resistance. Hans Baron has argued persuasively in one of his articles for the influence of Bucer on Calvin's original statement of the theory.⁴⁶ Other scholars have pointed out other lines of

influence. But the tracing of the Magdeburg influence does, I feel, rather neatly illustrate the international development and spread of this theory.

These, then, were important contributions which the Calvinist churches offered to the revolutionary Protestant political parties in France and the Low Countries during the sixteenth century: synodical organization, noble leadership, a theory of resistance. This pattern of analysis could, I feel, be extended to other countries. Scotland is the first example that occurs to me. There John Knox organized the church which was to become Presbyterian, cooperated closely with the noble "Lords of the Congregation" who actually led the revolt against Queen Regent Mary of Guise, and in advance of all this outlined and broadcast a resistance theory, which was apparently derived in part from the Magdeburg *Bekentnis*.⁴⁷ But limitations of space prevent me from pressing the point. I hope that what I have been able to present persuades at least some of you of my conviction: that the revolts of the sixteenth century cannot be viewed solely as chapters in separate national histories; they must also be considered as in part at least the work of a revolutionary international religious organization—the Calvinist Church.

1. H. G. Koenigsberger, "The Organization of Revolutionary Parties in France and the Netherlands during the Sixteenth Century," *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol XXVII, No. 4 (December, 1955), pp. 335-351. Cf. Garrett Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (London, 1955), pp. 193-196.

2. Koenigsberger, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

3. Edited copies of much of the archival material relating to the Low Countries can be found in Herman de Vries de Heekelingen, *Genève, pépinière du calvinisme hollandais*; t. I, *Les étudiants des pays-bas à Genève au temps de Théodore de Bèze* (Fribourg, Switzerland, 1918); t. II, *Correspondance des élèves de Théodore de Bèze après leur départ de Genève* (the Hague, 1924). See also the many works of A. A. van Schelven. For discussion of the archival material relating to France, see Robert M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the coming of the wars of religion in France, 1555-1563* (Geneva: Droz, 1956). Hereafter cited as de Vries de Heekelingen and Kingdon, *Geneva*.

4. Not many of these testimonial letters have been preserved. For a good copy of one, see de Vries de Heekelingen, I, 297-298, a transcript of an entry in Geneva, Archives, Register of the Company of Pastors, B2, 1572, fol. 72v.

5. These dates, and much of the information in the paragraph, are taken from the official Registers of the Geneva Company of Pastors, preserved in the Geneva Archives d'Etat, consulted with the permission of the present Geneva Company of Pastors. See Kingdon, *Geneva*, p. 2, and *passim*, for information on the first men officially sent. See *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français*, VIII (1859), p. 76, for a list of pastors sent from Geneva, abstracted from these registers, which contains many errors of transcription but does include reliable information about the first man officially sent to the Low Countries.

6. See Kingdon, *Geneva*, p. 46, and *passim*, on the French synod and local church organization. Source references can be found in the notes. On the Emden synod, see F. L. Rutgers, ed., *Acta van de nederlandsche synoden der zestiende eeuw, in Werken der Marnix-Vereeniging*, serie II, deel III (Utrecht, 1889), pp. 42-119; note also the articles adopted by an even earlier gathering ("samenkomst") of representatives of the Low Countries' churches in Wesel, 1568, in *ibid.*, pp. 1-41. For information on Calvinist church organization in the Belgian provinces, see E. de Moreau, *Histoire*

- de l'église en Belgique*, t. V (Brussels, 1952), pp. 215-227. A useful collection of early provincial synodical records can be found in N. C. Kist, ed., "De synoden der nederlandsche hervormde kerken onder het kruis, gedurende de jaren 1563-1577, gehouden in Brabant, Vlaanderen enz.," *Nederlandsche Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis*, IX, in *Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis inzonderheid van Nederland*, XX (1849), pp. 114-120. Mr. Maurice Edie and Miss Nancy Knapp called my attention to the last two references.
7. For an authoritative study of these refugee churches, see A. A. van Schelven *De nederduitse vluchtelingenkerken der XVIIe eeuw in Engeland en Duitschland, in hunne beteeknis voor de reformatie in de Nederlanden* (the Hague, 1909). On the London church see also J. Lindeboom, *Austin Friars: History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London* (the Hague, 1950).
 8. J. de Wal, "Nederlanders en personen die later met Nederland in betrekking stonden, studenten te Heidelberg en Genève sedert het begin der kerkhervorming," *Maatsch. Ned. Letterk. Handelingen & Mededeelingen* (1865), pp. 59-270; J. de Wal, "Nederlanders, studenten te Heidelberg," in *ibid.* (1886), pp. 1-55; cited by de Vries de Heekelingen, I, 188.
 9. Geneva, Archives, Registres du Conseil, 5 August 1586, quoted in de Vries de Heekelingen, I, 23.
 10. The best documented example of such a muster is that supervised by the synod of upper Guyenne held in Ste-Foy, in November 1561. See *Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France*, ed. by G. Baum and Ed. Cunitz, I (Paris, 1883), pp. 803-804 (original pagination). For further information see Kingdon, *Geneva*, pp. 109 and ff.
 11. The relevant text in the synodical minutes is quoted by Bakhuizen van den Brink, in his introduction to R. C. Bakhuizen van den Brink, L. Ph. C. van Bergh, & J. K. J. de Jonge, eds., *Les archives du royaume des pays-bas: recueil de documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire des pays-bas* (the Hague, Leipzig, Brussels, Paris, 1855), pp. 27-28. Hereafter cited as Bakhuizen van den Brink.
 12. Paul-F. Geisendorf, *Théodore de Bèze* (Geneva, 1949), pp. 3-4, quotes from the text of the 1551 patent of reintegration into the nobility, granted to his father. See the succeeding pages for further biographical information. For general information on France during this period, see P. Inbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme*, t. IV, *Calvin et l'Institution Chrétienne* (Paris, 1935), and Lucien Romier, *Les origines politiques des guerres de religion*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1913-1914); *La conjuration d'Amboise . . .* (Paris, 1923); *Catholiques et Huguenots à la cour de Charles IX . . .* (1560-1562) (Paris, 1924); *Le royaume de Catherine de Médicis . . .*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1922).
 13. Albert Elkan, *Philipp Marnix von St. Aldegonde; teil I: Die Jugend Johannis und Philipps von Marnix* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 7 and ff., discusses the documents which provide proof of Marnix's nobility. One of them was published by Marnix himself. See Alb. Laeroix, ed., *Oeuvres de Ph. de Marnix de Sainte Aldegonde*, t. V. *Ecrits politiques et historiques* (Brussels, 1859), pp. 86-93, originally published as an appendix to text of Marnix's *Response à un libelle fameux naguères publié contre Monseigneur le Prince d'Oranges* (Antwerp, 1579). This collection hereafter cited as Marnix, *Oeuvres*, Laeroix ed.
 14. E. Droz, "Antoine Vincent: la propagande protestante par le psautier," *Aspects de la propagande religieuse* (Geneva: Droz, 1957), pp. 276-293.
 15. J. J. van Toorenenbergen, ed., *Philipp van Marnix van St. Aldegonde: godsdienstige en kerkelijke geschriften*, 3 vols. plus supplement (the Hague, 1871-1891), I, 1-1xxi, for commentary; 183-438, for text. Hereafter cited as Marnix, *Geschriften*, van Toorenenbergen, ed.
 16. Frans van Kalken and Tobie Jonckheere, *Marnix de Sainte Aldegonde (1540-1598): le politique et le pamphlétaire; le pédagogue* (Brussels, 1952), pp. 15-28.
 17. Geisendorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 439-441, contains a preliminary list of Beza's works, practically all of which are discussed in his text. A complete bibliography of Beza's works has yet to be published.
 18. *Ibid.*, pp. 65 and ff.
 19. Marnix, *Geschriften*, van Toorenenbergen, ed., II, ii-xxi, for commentary; 1-240, for text.
 20. Geisendorf, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Marnix, *Geschriften*, van Toorenenbergen, ed., *passim*.
 21. Geisendorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 82 and ff.
 22. Henri Naef, *La conjuration d'Amboise et Genève* (Geneva, 1922), pp. 487-496, 555 and ff., and *passim*.
 23. For a detailed description of this plot see Lucien Romier, *La conjuration d'Amboise . . .* (Paris, 1923), pp. 215-231. Cf. Naef, *op. cit.*, pp. 519-521, and Kingdon, *Geneva*, p. 75.
 24. Geisendorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-166, and *passim*.
 25. See Kingdon, *Geneva*, pp. 106-114, for documentation on the succeeding details of Beza's activity.

26. Geisendorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 360 and ff.
27. For information on Marnix's career see van Kalken and Jonckheere, *op. cit.*, and A. A. van Schelven, *Marnix van Sint Aldegonde* (Utrecht, 1939). A good introduction to the general history of Low Countries' diplomacy during this period is P. Geyl, *The revolt of the Netherlands (1555-1609)* (London, 1932; reprinted 1945). See also the works of H. A. Enno van Gelder, e.g. *Revolutionnaire reformatie* (Amsterdam, 1943).
28. Marnix, *Oeuvres*, Lacroix ed., V, 17-22.
29. For general studies of Calvinist political theory, see J. W. Allen, *A history of political thought in the sixteenth century* (London, 1951), pp. 49-72; 103-120; 302-331; also Pierre Mesnard, *L'essor de la philosophie politique au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1952), pp. 269-385; and for the Low Countries. Ch. Mercier, "Les théories politiques des calvinistes dans les pay-bas à la fin du XVIe et au début du XVIIe siècle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXIX (1933), 25-73.
30. e.g. Allen, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59; Mesnard, *op. cit.*, p. 294. The original text can be found in John Calvin, *Ioannis Calvinii Opera quae supersunt omnia* (*Corpus Reformatorum*, Vols. 29ff., Brunswick, 1863-1900), II, 1116 and ff. (1559 Latin ed. of *Institutes*) and IV, 1160 and ff. (1560 French ed. of *Institutes*).
31. Robert M. Kingdon, "The First Expression of Theodore Beza's Political Ideas," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XLVI (1955), Heft 1, 88-100. Hereafter cited as Kingdon, *Beza*.
32. e.g. Calvin as quoted in Naef, *op. cit.*, pp. 462-463. Cf. Kingdon, *Geneva*, p. 69, and *passim*.
33. A contemporary description of these events can be found in John Sleidan, *The General History of the Reformation of the Church...* (London, 1689, translated from the original Latin), p. 436, and *passim*. The publication of the Magdeburg *Bekentnis* is described on p. 496. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 104, n. 2, is wrong in saying that Sleidan misdates the *Bekentnis*. He actually describes two separate pamphlets; the one which is clearly the *Bekentnis* is correctly dated. Mr. Elmer L. Lampe, Jr., called this source to my attention. For a more modern account, see Friedrich Hülsse, *Die Stadt Magdeburg im Kampfe für den Protestantismus während der Jahre 1547-1551* (Halle a. S., 1892).
34. Kingdon, *Beza*, 93-94.
35. Relevant sources cited, and some quoted, in Geisendorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 312 and ff.
36. Full title: "DV DROIT / DES MAGISTRATS / SVR LEVRS SVBIETS. / Traitté tres-necessaire en ce temps, pour ad- / uertir de leur devoir, tant les Magistrats que / les Subiets: publié par ceux de Magdebourg / l'an MDL: & maintenant reueu & / augmenté de plusieurs raisons / & exemples. / (mark) / PSAL. 2. / Erudimini qui indicatis terram. / M.D. LXXIX. /" I used the copy in the Newberry Library.
37. G. Groen van Prinsterer, ed., *Archives ou correspondance inédits de la maison d'Orange-Nassau*, series 1 (Leiden, 1835-1847, 8 vols. plus index vol.), vol. II, 37. Hereafter cited as *Archives d'Orange-Nassau*.
38. A. A. van Schelven, "Beza's De Iure Magistratum in Subditos," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XLV (1954), Heft I, p. 63 and n. 3.; Moriz Ritter, "Über die Anfänge des niederländischen Aufstandes," *Historische Zeitschrift*, LVIII (neue folge XXII) (1887), 425. The first article hereafter cited as van Schelven, *Beza*.
39. Bakhuizen van den Brink, p. 27.
40. *Archives d'Orange-Nassau*, series 1, vol. VI, 35.
41. van Schelven, *Beza*, pp. 65-68. The question of the relation between Machiavellism and Protestant social thought is dealt with in broader fashion in George L. Mosse, *The Holy Pretences: a study in Christianity and reason of state from William Perkins to John Winthrop* (Oxford, 1957). He does not mention this physical uniting of the two theories.
42. *Archives d'Orange-Nassau*, series 1, vol. VII, 132.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 254.
44. "THE APOLOGIE / OR / DEFENCE, OF / THE MOST NOBLE / Prince William, by the grace of God, / Prince of ORANGE,... / Printed in French and in all other languages. / AT DELFT / 1581. /," signature H-3 verso. I used a microfilm of copy #30716 in the Huntington Library. The passage is also quoted in Mercier, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
45. It is very likely that a Calvinist wrote the *Apologie* for William. Grotius attributes the authorship of it to Pastor Villiers, who was Orange's chaplain, and, incidentally, served as one of the intermediaries in the correspondence previously noted between John of Nassau and the pastors of Geneva. Others have attributed authorship to Hubert Languet, prominent Calvinist nobleman, diplomat, and publicist. Evidence for both views is discussed in Pierre Bayle, "Hubert Languet," *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 4th ed., III (1730).

It is, of course, possible that Calvin and the author of the *Apologie* both drew the analogy to the Ephors of Sparta independently from some classical source. The most likely source seems to be Cicero, *De legibus*, III, 16, a passage which draws an analogy between the Ephors and the Roman Tribunes which is much like Calvin's, but omits Calvin's erroneous references to the "demarchi" of Athens. For the precise references in Calvin's *Institutes*, see above, n. 30. For evidence that Calvin frequently borrowed ideas from the *De legibus* and other writings of Cicero, see Josef Bohatec, *Calvin und das Recht* (Feudingen in West-

falen, 1934), and *Budd und Calvin: Studien zur Gedankenwelt des französischen Frühhumanismus* (Graz, 1950).

46. Hans Baron, "Calvinist Republicanism and its Historical Roots," *Church History*, VIII (1939), 30-42.
47. John Knox, *History of the Reformation in Scotland*. The most recent critical edition is that of William Croft Dickinson (London, et al., 1949, 2 vols.). See II, 129-130, for Knox's reference to the "Apology of Magdeburg." For the best examples of his resistance theory, see the David Laing edition of *The Works of John Knox*, vol. IV (Edinburgh, 1895), 349-540.

1960 Brewer Prize Contest

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a book-length manuscript in church history will conclude in 1960. The award will be announced at the annual meeting of the Society in December of that year. It will consist of a subsidy of one thousand dollars to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title-page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of the Secretary, Professor Winthrop S. Hudson, 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester 20, New York, by September 15, 1960. There must be two copies, a typescript and a first carbon, on standard weight paper, double-spaced, with a left-hand margin of at least an inch and one-half.

REVOLUTIONARY CALVINIST PARTIES IN ENGLAND UNDER ELIZABETH I AND CHARLES I

LEO F. SOLT, *Indiana University*

Some of the comparative ideas that Mr. Kingdon has dealt with in the foregoing article are elaborations of views that he suggested in his recent monograph, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion, 1555-1563*. In a recent review of this book by Sir John Neale the author is praised for claiming that the "highly-organized subversive conspiracy from Geneva," which was so important in the French wars of religion, "has a bearing on Dutch and English, not to mention Scottish, history." What is more, Neale indicates that he "certainly finds it illuminating for an appreciation of the Puritan Classical movement in Elizabethan history."¹ It might be worth-while, therefore, to extend the discussion by briefly examining Mr. Kingdon's criteria for "revolutionary Calvinist parties" in connection with England in the age of Elizabeth and, later, with the period of the English civil wars of the mid-seventeenth century. Those criteria include a synodical organization, noble leadership, and a resistance theory.

At the outset it certainly seems as if the three basic ingredients for the appearance of a revolutionary Calvinist party are present in Elizabethan England. The Calvinist theory of resistance received a dramatic statement from the pens of John Ponet, John Knox, Christopher Goodman, and Anthony Gilby, who all (except Ponet) worked together at Geneva during the Marian exile. Ponet went so far as to justify tyrannicide, whereas the other three argued that no "idolater," let alone any woman, could expect to receive obedience from the subject.² The Genevan ecclesiastical discipline found its English counterpart from 1572-1590 in the Puritan Classical movement with an ascending hierarchy of parish, classis, provincial synod, and national assembly. If the Puritan Classical movement did not transform itself into a military organization or put arms into the hands of its constituents as it endeavored to reform the Anglican church,³ it did attempt to set up "a discipline in a discipline, presbytery in episcopacy."⁴ As for leadership, not only were several members of Elizabeth's privy council sympathetic to the Puritans—the earls of Leicester and Warwick are examples from the nobility—but also the Classical movement had its own distinguished leaders in John Field, Walter Travers, and Thomas Cartwright, the last of whom had Leicester for a patron. Although not of noble birth themselves, Cartwright and Travers were invited by Scottish Presbyterians to hold chairs at St. Andrews; both men associated with Calvinists from the Netherlands; Travers had his *Explicatio* published by the same secret press that printed the Hugue-

not reaction to the St. Bartholomew massacre; and Cartwright associated with Theodore Beza for a time in Geneva.⁵

Despite the presence of the foregoing factors, the Puritan demands for reform of the Anglican church clearly did not develop into a revolutionary situation in the reign of Elizabeth. A second look at Mr. Kingdon's criteria indicates that the theory of resistance received its full expression before 1560. Once Elizabeth was on the throne, the English Puritans reverted to the orthodox Protestant doctrine of obedience. Although there was continuity in Scotland between Knox and Buchanan on the right to resist a civil ruler, little was to be heard of these revolutionary ideas in England from Puritan pens until the 1630's.⁶ A second look at the leadership, particularly Cartwright, indicates that he consistently preached a policy of "tarrying for the magistrate," that is to say, of waiting for the magistrate to proceed with a more godly reformation.⁷ "We be ready," wrote Cartwright, "to give that subjection unto the prince and offer ourselves to the prince's correction in things wherein we shall do amiss."⁸ A second look at the Classical movement shows that it exploited, as Neale tells us, "the modern art of parliamentary lobbying."⁹ Thus, the Classical movement tried to work by legal means as Cartwright attests: "We had special care in our meetings to keep ourselves in obedience to the laws."¹⁰

If we ask ourselves why a well-disciplined and well-armed Calvinist revolutionary party never materialized in England in the sixteenth century as it did in Scotland, Holland, and France, I think the answer lies in the uniqueness of the English situation.

To begin with, England had already expended much of her nationalist spirit against the Papacy during Henry VIII's quarrels with the Roman Church. The famous Act in Restraint of Appeals (1533) declared England to be an "empire" free from the control of the Roman Catholic Church. But the cause of Scottish Presbyterianism received a powerful impetus from the nation's anti-French outlook, just as for many Dutchmen the fight for the true faith was reinforced by a violent hatred of the Spanish tyrant. In England, the question of foreign influence after Queen Mary was never a serious problem again until Charles II's reign.

But even more important in the English situation was the absence after 1588 of a Catholic sovereign, who, as in France and Holland, served as a constant reminder of the Roman Antichrist. Instead, England was possessed of a sovereign who by 1570 was a declared enemy of Rome. What is more, the Puritans regarded Elizabeth as their only shield against the Scarlet Woman; therefore Elizabeth's Calvinist subjects did not entertain ideas of revolt against her. This Protestant

Deborah could pose for reasons of state as the champion of Scottish, Dutch, and French Calvinists in their struggles for liberty; she saw the Puritans as a strong bulwark against Catholic threats to England. When the most serious of those threats had died with the failure of the Enterprise of England in 1588, Elizabeth was free to prosecute the Puritans such as Cartwright.

Until 1590, however, the Puritans were relatively free from persecution by the state. This was true not only because of the restraining hand upon the Queen of councillors like Sir Francis Walsingham until about 1590, but also because there were many bishops who had experienced a rather similar kind of religious belief when they, too, had been in exile during Mary Tudor's reign. Consequently, English Puritans did not undergo such bloody and humiliating persecutions as Calvinists on the continent were forced to withstand.

Instead, English Calvinists were able to direct their energies toward parliamentary activity. Here the Puritan faction from the very beginning of the reign, as the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity indicate, were able to make their vociferous minority a powerful factor to be reckoned with by the Queen. And although their influence there, as far as church reform was concerned, was increasingly less and less, they at least had an institution, deeply-rooted in tradition, into which they could infiltrate themselves in order to effect their godly reformation. Such opportunities for parliamentary influence often were not available to Calvinists in other countries.

What it all means, then, in England, is that despite the presence of an ecclesiastical discipline, that discipline chose to change from within, to tarry for the magistrate, rather than to subvert the state by force of arms. Hence its leadership was cautious, preferring to work within Parliament rather than to brandish the sword in behalf of a resistance theory.

When we come to consider the civil war period of the seventeenth century, the case in behalf of Mr. Kingdon's thesis is initially even more impressive than during the sixteenth century. In addition, the revolutionary situation which did not develop in Elizabeth's day did materialize in the early 1640's. The revolutionary ideology is there, resplendent in the writings of Henry Parker, William Prynne, and John Milton, among others. The synodical organization is abundantly evident in the gradual establishment of the Presbyterian church, a Scottish import, from 1643-1648, and foreshadowed in the Grand Remonstrance of 1641 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. Furthermore, there is Gardiner's evidence, supplemented by Coates' study of D'ewes' diary, that the opposition party in the Commons grew out of those who wished to carry Church reform farthest.¹¹ As for noble

leaders, there is an abundance: men like Sir Henry Vane the younger and Oliver Cromwell. Although some of them tend to come from what Professor Tawney calls the "rising" gentry and what Professor Trevor-Roper calls the "declining" gentry, whatever their social inclination they were joined by titled noblemen who at least provided leadership on the field of battle until more effective generalship was displayed by Cromwell.¹² In the 1640's it does seem to add up, if not to an international Calvinist movement, at least to a notion of the Protestant faith which would transcend national boundaries.¹³ Edinburgh, for England, had replaced Geneva.

In order to meet the plans of Archbishop Laud to impose a new Service book upon the Kirk, the Scots turned to a National Covenant, a political parallel to Covenant theology. The Covenant idea did not stem from Geneva but was indigenous to England and Scotland, receiving sustenance from the Rhineland reformers such as Bucer and Peter Martyr. By the end of the sixteenth century, says Trinterud, covenant theology had been assimilated into English Puritanism as well as Scottish Presbyterianism.¹⁴ The Westminster Confession of Faith, drawn up by Scottish and English divines, is one of the classic formulations of this covenant theology. However, the theological similarity between the two nations was not accompanied by a similar development in the forms of church government. Whereas the Kirk acted as a cohesive force, increasingly nationalistic and conservative, among the disparate aspects of Scottish society, the Church in England only served to increase the divisions within society.

In the 1630's and early 1640's most English Puritans were not strongly advocating the Presbyterian form of church government. As the great Puritan divine, Richard Baxter, put it: "Though a Presbytery generally took in Scotland, yet it was but a stranger here."¹⁵ It was only after the perilous military situation of 1642 and 1643 that the English parliamentary leaders, largely as a measure of military expediency, solicited Scottish aid in exchange for a promise to call the Westminster Assembly to consider the reformation of the Church of England "according to the example of the best Reformed churches." Even then, Sir Henry Vane the younger was able to insert the phrase "according to the Word of God," thus opening the way for something other than Scottish Presbyterianism.

The English Puritans and the Scottish Presbyterians had rebelled against Charles I, their mutual sovereign, not because of a common conviction of the divine authority of Calvinist church government but because of a common opposition to a persecuting Laudian regime. To meet this crisis the Scottish Presbyterians turned to the political counterpart of their Covenant theology, namely a National Covenant.

In the National Covenant, Scottish nobles, gentry, and commoners bound themselves to defend each other and the true religion against all persons whatsoever.¹⁶ At this, Charles reluctantly called a General Assembly of the Kirk which proceeded to abolish the Service book and the institution of prelacy, while the Scottish Parliament was to be called only to ratify the Assembly's acts. English Puritans, on the other hand, though fired by the idea of Scottish resistance, turned instead to the pulpit, the press, and particularly to Parliament for leadership in their opposition to Charles I. The ultimate abolition of episcopacy by the Long Parliament is a testimonial of their success there. Nevertheless, the Presbyterianism adopted by the English Parliament (but never uniformly established throughout England) was essentially Erastian rather than theocratic as in Scotland. In other words, and oversimplifying, the state was the predominant partner in the church-state relationship in England, whereas the church was the predominant partner in the church-state relationship in Scotland. Here is the continuity with the Erastian Anglicanism of Elizabeth's day, whereas the traces of Elizabethan Presbyterianism upon Caroline Presbyterianism are extremely difficult to establish.

If the Presbyterian church discipline was not the animus behind the English Parliament's opposition to the King,¹⁷ even less was this true within the Army. It is customary to say that with the new-modeling of the parliamentary forces by Cromwell, all of the Presbyterians left and the New Model Army had a definite Independent outlook. My own studies of the chaplains of the Army indicate that these men (including Cromwell at this time) were not animated by the desire to establish congregational forms; indeed, they were "spiritual anarchists," intent upon preaching the gospel of the Holy Spirit to all groups, to nobleman and "mechanick" alike. It was essentially a kind of Antinomianism (not at all in the derogatory sense of that word), which had little use for the legalistic covenants of either Scottish or English reformers, and which rather inarticulately formulated its own spiritual, almost mystical, view of a millenarian society. It was this strand of Puritanism, usually associated with the growth of the sects after the collapse of episcopacy, that sought the establishment of a holy community in terms of rule by the good and religious men over the evil and irreligious.

I do not wish to suggest that Antinomianism spells the difference between an unsuccessful Calvinist faction under Elizabeth and a temporarily successful Puritan party under Charles. But it does suggest a religious goal in England, as does the Covenant idea in Scotland, which would not have been fundamental to John Calvin.¹⁸ To be sure there were powerful non-religious factors (constitutional, political, social,

and economic) that also accounted for the opposition to Charles I. But their relative importance is another and even more complicated problem outside the scope of this comment. Suffice it to say that Cromwell's statement seems to be a fairly accurate one: "Religion was not the thing we first quarrelled about, but later it came to that."¹⁹ But as far as the religious factor is concerned in the formation of opposition to the King, about the only thing that was imported to England as an example of an international Calvinist movement in the civil war period, was the example of a successful revolt by the Scots against their King.

1. *History*, XLII (October, 1957), 231-32.
2. Christopher Morris, *Political Thought in England, Tyndale to Hooker* (London, 1953), p. 146.
3. R. G. Usher, ed., *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth as Illustrated by the Minute Book of the Dedham Classis* (Camden Publications: London, 1905), p. xviii.
4. J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1584-1601* (London, 1957), p. 19.
5. A. F. Scott Pearson, *Church and State, Political Aspects of Sixteenth Century Puritanism* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 65.
6. Morris, *Political Thought*, p. 156.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
8. Pearson, *Church and State*, p. 65.
9. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1584-1601*, p. 151.
10. Usher, *The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, p. xxii.
11. Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, new edition (London, 1893-1895), X, 10-15; *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'ewes, from the First Ecess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London*, edited by Willson Havelock Coates (New Haven, 1952), pp. xxv-xxix.
12. Continental observers took the English gentry for lesser nobility inasmuch as they looked so much like European "hidalgos" or "hobereaux."
13. David Mathew, *The Age of Charles I* (London, 1951), p. 298.
14. Leonard J. Trinterud, "The Origins of Puritanism," *Church History*, XX (March, 1951), pp. 40, 49.
15. Richard Baxter, *Autobiography*, I, p. 146, quoted in William A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660* (London, 1900), I, 6.
16. William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York, 1955), p. 7.
17. Jack H. Hexter, *The Reign of King Pym* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941). On pp. 97-98 Hexter says that the war faction and peace faction in Parliament in 1643 were split on the religious question.
18. On the relation of Calvin to Covenant theology, see Everett H. Emerson, "Calvin and Covenant Theology," *Church History*, XXV (June, 1956), p. 141.
19. Speech IV, Carlyle, II, 417, quoted in Godfrey Davies, *The Early Stuarts* (Oxford, 1937), p. 125.

THE RULE OF THE SAINTS IN AMERICAN POLITICS

JERALD C. BRAUER, *University of Chicago*

It has been observed that in America the preachers act like politicians and the politicians talk like preachers. Recent developments in American politics have given renewed support to this observation. There are a number of possible explanations as to why the American public is so concerned, at this particular time in history, to appear as a godly people and nation. However, the question that immediately presents itself to the historian is why the American public so quickly responds to the religious motif in political life.

Probably in no other modern nation would it be possible to use so successfully the concept of crusade in campaigning. Moral fervor and religious idealism are essentials in the political concerns of a people who enthusiastically engage in a political crusade. Americans eagerly respond to the idea of a "godly" man in the White House. They feel that such a man can be trusted in the dubious game of politics. Certainly he has a much better opportunity of deciding between right and wrong in matters of domestic and foreign policy.

Equally gratifying to the American public is the sight of our Congressional leaders led in frequent public prayer by the executive branch of government. This is a guarantee of the essential righteousness of political deliberations. A further manifestation of this American tendency to relate closely religion and politics is the repeated assertion that this nation was founded on specific beliefs concerning God and the universe. Politics must be exercised on the basis of these beliefs, or at least the public must be constantly reassured by public pronouncements and symbolic acts that this is a nation under God. So strong has this feeling become that this reassuring phrase has been written into the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

A parallel and closely related phenomenon in American politics is the constant tendency to moralize about national virtues. Americans are convinced that they are a chosen people. Providence has selected them for a special task and blessed them because of their faithful performance in that task. Because the American people have been essentially a good people they have become a powerful and a rich people. In these days of struggle against forces of atheism, the role of the American people as the upholders of good or righteousness against evil is even clearer in the minds of many Americans. From this perspective it is only too easy to reduce complex issues, particularly in foreign affairs, to a simple problem of right or wrong.

This has prompted Reinhold Niebuhr to comment,

America's moral and spiritual success in relating itself creatively to a world community requires, not so much a guard against the gross vices, about which the idealists warn us, as a reorientation of the whole structure of our idealism. That idealism is too oblivious of the ironic perils to which human virtue, wisdom and power are subject. It is too certain that there is a straight path toward the goal of human happiness; too confident of the wisdom and idealism which prompt men and nations toward that goal; and too blind to the curious compounds of good and evil in which the actions of the best men and nations abound.¹

What has created and maintained this kind of "idealism" in American life? What accounts for this strong religious motif in American politics? Obviously the answer is manifold and complex. One cannot overlook factors such as the role of the frontier, the successive waves of immigrants coming with economic and spiritual hopes, the various ideals, philosophies, and experiments introduced into American life, the economic development of the nation, and its geographic location. Religion is one force, if not the most important force, that has created this "idealism" in American life.

Among the various religious influences shaping American life is Puritanism. Volumes have been written to assess the positive contributions of Puritanism to American democracy or to expose it as anti-democratic, aristocratic, and bigoted.² Much can be said on both sides. However, it is the thesis of this paper that for better or for worse one facet of Puritan life has proved to be one of the key forces in shaping American political life. That is the Puritan ideal that the saints should rule.

Few scholars would deny that the New England Puritans set up a theocracy, if by theocracy one means the church and saints exercising definitive power in the political order. The rule of the saints in a holy commonwealth fairly well describes the Puritan state in New England. Because of this, much of the discussion of theocracy has concerned itself primarily with religious liberty or political liberty, democracy or aristocracy.³ This is one fruitful way of approaching the problem. Its limitation is that it ceases to be useful with the passing of the theocracy or the rule of the saints and the emergence of religious liberty.

When the Puritans argued that the saints should rule, their view embodied two key points. First, the way God ruled in political life was through his saints. It is in this sense that one can speak of the Puritan theocracy. God did not rule directly but through His saints; nevertheless, it was His will that was to prevail. Secondly, the saints were not simply clergymen but all the elect who signified their membership in Christ's Church through public profession of faith. Such a "theocracy" did not necessarily demand the rule of the clergy. It only demanded the rule of the saints.

Centering attention on the ideal of the rule of the saints is an at-

tempt to move behind the Puritan church-state arrangement or the degree of political liberty operative in the holy commonwealth. It is an attempt to understand the basic intention of the Puritans as to the role of religion in political life and then to assess how this role has been transformed while persisting in American life. Though the theocracy soon collapsed and though political and religious liberty were finally attained, the Puritan vision of the political order subdued to God and operating under his will by his people was not lost. It persisted in American life through various transformations until thoroughly secularized.

To be sure, one dare not ignore the institutional forms in which the rule of the saints is encountered. Not only are institutions formed by the ideal or pattern, but they also form and transform it. The theocratic ideal held by the Puritans differs greatly from the Jewish or the Roman Catholic formulation of the theocratic pattern. The fact that they arise at different points in history and in different cultures cannot be overlooked. The Puritan theocratic ideal was embodied in particular institutional forms in early seventeenth century American life. As these institutions changed and developed, the ideal persisted. Though it appeared to be superseded it actually was transformed in such a way that it continued to influence, if not to dominate, certain aspects of American life.

Exactly what was the Puritan theocratic ideal? Theologically, it is based on the assumption that God is the source, sustainer, and judge of all that exists. No reason can be given for this, for if a reason could be given God would no longer be God but some greater principle would be ultimate. There was no facet of life that was not under the judgment of God and responsible to him.⁴ This held true not simply of personal beliefs and morality but was equally true of nature, history, all human activities and institutions such as government, economics, art, literature, education, or the family.

Granted this basic theological assumption, the Puritan asserted that politics as well as personal morality was under the kingship of the Lord God Almighty. His will would prevail here as elsewhere. So the Puritan theocratic ideal was compounded of the following elements. First, that God has a definite will for culture, society, and the state. He has a general will to achieve peace, order, and security, but he also has a more specific will that is to be brought to bear by a particular people in particular times and places.

Secondly, this will of God can be known. It has been made manifest in history through the people and prophets of Israel, and it was fully revealed in Jesus the Christ. The Bible is the infallible record of it. This will of God for society was originally written into the struc-

ture of the universe and into the reason of man. But, as a consequence of the fall, man unaided by God can not actually achieve this will.

Thirdly, not only is God's will known through Scripture, reason, and the Christ; it is also mediated through definite channels and brought to bear in society. The channels through which God has chosen to mediate his will as revealed in Scripture are his elect—the saints, particularly the ministers, education under Christian supervision, and special providences in history. Through these channels God's will is applied to the political decisions and cultural life in such a way that the total life is made conformable to his will. This application can occur through a king, parliament, magistrates, or the ballot box, depending on the situation. The important thing is that God's will mediated through his chosen channels is brought to bear effectively in the common life.

A closer analysis of these three elements in the Puritan theocratic ideal indicates the intention of the pattern. The Puritan motto might well have been "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." There was not a single action of life possible apart from God. Cotton expressed this clearly in his commentary on *Ecclesiastes* when he said:

Thy Creator, setteth forth God as the author and fountain of all our being out of nothing; which argueth God to be, 1. The end of all our being. . . . 2. Our preserver and governor. . . . 3. Our owner and possessor and Lord. . . . 4. Intimately acquainted with all our ways. . . . 5. Unwilling, yea, disdaining to have his work deformed or corrupted. . . . 6. Able easily to destroy us. . . .⁵

God ruled the total lives of men whether they knew it or not. As Professor Miller has indicated so clearly, the Puritans were constantly torn between emphasis on God's direct rule and emphasis on his mediate rule.⁶ In general, they agreed with the Savoy Declaration that "God in his ordinary Providence maketh use of Means, yet is free to work without, above, and against them at his pleasure."⁷ But the important thing was that God ruled, that he had a will for society and for culture, and that his will would triumph.

Hence, the real problem was how to know the will of God. Could it be known only through the Bible? What then of the place of the Holy Spirit or of man's reason? Were history and experience of use in seeking to know God's will for society? On these things Puritans were in full agreement. The will of God for society can be known through the Bible. Cotton summarized this:

I am very apt to believe, what Mr. Perkins hath, in one of his prefatory pages to his golden chaine, that the word, and scriptures of God doe conteyne a short upoluposis, or platforme, not onely of theology, but also of other sacred sciences . . . which he maketh ethicks, economicks, politicks, church-government, prophecy, academy.⁸

This does not mean that the Puritans believed that the Bible contained specific answers to guide the day to day practice of such things as ethics, economics, or politics. They were explicit in arguing that while government itself is from God, yet no particular form of government is the Christian form.⁹ Whatever kind of government was operative, men must recognize its source as from God.

The fact was, however, that the Puritans really went beyond their constant affirmations concerning the elasticity of political form. They contradicted their theory at a number of points. John Winthrop, in commenting on a sermon preached by Nathaniel Ward, complained that he grounded his political discourse too much on Greek and Roman government. The Puritans possess the word of God and can draw on the additional experience of Christian history so that "we may better form rules of government for ourselves than to receive others upon the base authority of the wisdom, justice, etc., of those heathen commonwealths."¹⁰

John Cotton went even further and argued that the Bible actually gives directions for the right ordering of the political state under certain conditions. He admits that the church of Christ may exist under any form of state, but he argues that when a commonwealth has the liberty

to mold his owne frame . . . I conceive the scripture hath given full direction for the right ordering of the same, and that, in such sort as may best mainteyne the *euxia* of the church. . . . It is better that the commonwealth be fashioned to the setting forth of God's house, which is his church: than to accomodate the church frame to the civill state.¹¹

The will of God for the political realm can be known through the Bible but is not to be found only or even primarily in the Old Testament. To be sure, the Puritans understood the moral law given in the ten commandments as binding for the social life of all people. Also they constantly referred to precedents in the government of Israel. However, the real manifestation of the will of God for mankind, including his political life, was to be found in Jesus Christ. God's will for all life could be most fully known in the life, teachings, death, resurrection, and triumph of Jesus. The Puritan cried out: Jesus is Lord, he is King over all life, and his will must prevail.

Many scholars have placed far too much emphasis on God's will for political life as revealed in the Old Testament and on his sovereignty ruling directly through secondary causes. On this basis it is difficult to understand how New England Puritans produced such a close relationship between a state unrelated to Christ with a church composed only of the "publically saved" in Christ. The fact was that even political life was finally to be patterned at least in broad outline on the commands of Christ.

In two respects the Puritans made clear the foundation of the state in the revelation of God not simply or primarily as encountered in the Old Testament but rather as revealed in Jesus the Christ. First, the usage of the covenant concept in political theory is based, not on the old covenant as found in the Old Testament but on the new covenant as found in Jesus Christ. To be sure, there were three covenants—the covenant of grace between the believer and Christ, the church covenant between the believers, and the civil covenant as the basis of the state. All three are based on the kingship of Jesus Christ, which determines the conditions of the covenant in all three instances. It is primarily on this basis that Cotton and Winthrop could argue for a state patterned after the demands of the church of Christ, or for believers in Christ alone possessing the rights of freemen. The civil covenant was definitely patterned on the church covenant, or the Congregational way.

The very essence of the Congregational way is the Kingship of Christ. Hooker clearly expressed this as the basis of the church life, "He is our King, he is our Law-giver; it is in his power and pleasure to provide his own laws, and appoint the waies of his own worship."¹² The Puritans did not have to rest simply on the precedents of the Old Testament, for to do so would have been to stand in the old covenant.

Their basic problem was to work out the meaning of Christ's rulership in the congregation and in the community. This could be possible only with those who lived the new life of faith in Christ.¹³ Natural man's recognition of and submission to God's will as revealed in the moral law was not enough; conversion to Christ was required. If the latter had been unnecessary for the Puritan there would never have been a Half-Way Covenant.

Cotton makes explicit that the rulership of Christ is of consequence in the determination not only of the general framework of government but also in such things as the right of franchise. Lord Say and Seal was greatly disturbed that only "visible" saints approved by the church had the right to hold office and choose magistrates. Cotton entreated him and his friends

in the name of the Lord Jesus, to consider, in meekness of wisdome, it is not any conceite or will of ours, but the holy counsell and will of the Lord Jesus (whom they seeke to serve as wee) that overruleth us in this case. . . . What pittie and grieffe were it, that the absence of the will of Christ should hinder good things from us!¹⁴

Secondly, the political realm was patterned on the will of God as more fully revealed in Jesus Christ in terms of the teachings of Jesus. To be sure, Roger Williams matched John Cotton quote for quote from the teachings of Jesus and finally forced him to turn to the church in Israel as a pattern for the proper church-state relationship. But even the title of Cotton's tracts reflect the intention of the content. His ob-

ject was to take the stigma from persecution through its baptism in the blood of the Lamb. Now that the truth is fully manifest in Christ those who reject it are either obstinate or not of the elect. In either case they have no rights under the rule of Christ's saints in freedom. Puritan writings abound with references to the teachings of Jesus and the consequence of his death and resurrection for the moral life of the believer.

Another way God's will for political-social life can be known is through secondary causes and through the law of nature. Man's reason and conscience working through experience, past and present, can determine the more or less general intent of God's will for the political realm. All men know that God wills peace, order, and justice for political society. Also, the Puritans understand that this cannot be achieved in any easy fashion. The particular solution in a given situation depends upon a number of factors. Nevertheless, even here, Puritans tended to assert the supremacy of the wise man of grace in preference to a man of natural wisdom in discerning the will of God in the political order.

Finally, the Puritan theocratic ideal asserted that the will of God for political life known through the Bible, particularly in the total event of Jesus Christ, could be brought to bear in life by God through his chosen instruments or channels. For the Puritans these instruments were the church itself, his ministers, the saints or the elect of God, and education at home and in the schools under strict supervision.

One need refer but briefly to the role of the church in the theocratic ideal. It is now clear that it was the basis of the entire holy commonwealth. It is clear that if the Puritans came to America, as Winthrop said, to establish a due form of government both civil and ecclesiastical, the ecclesiastical took precedence. The civil government with its emphasis on compact and consent was framed according to it as much as possible. The church was the institution where Christ ruled directly. There the Bible and the will of God were discerned. There believers were brought through a new birth with full citizenship rights both in heaven and on earth. As Cotton put it, the Church "prepareth fitt instruments both to rule, and to choose rulers. . ."¹⁵

Early New England Puritanism was explicit as to what instruments God had chosen to effect his will in the political order. Here again the church provided the model for the state and the kingship of Christ was the basis for both. Only men converted to the will of Christ could really understand God's will and act accordingly. Though the church was made visible through the covenant between believers, this did not make a democracy in church government. The people in the

congregation actually did not rule, only Christ ruled through a "supreme and monarchical" power.¹⁶

The people in the church did not even make the laws or ordinances which govern the church. They did not invent the offices of the church or set the conditions for membership; all this they received from Christ through his word. Though the members of the congregation elected the officers of the church, they were not exercising a right of their own. They were only exercising a stewardship in behalf of their king.¹⁷ The grounds for this stewardship were given in God's word. The people could only elect those "whom they feel the Lord Jesus hath prepared . . . and as it were, chosen and ordained to their hands."¹⁸

It is clear that the church members exercised the freedom of selection of officers and members within strict limitations, and these limitations were not derived from a fundamental law or common rights of the entire group. Christ was king and his will was revealed in Scripture. The elders interpreted Scripture and the will of God to the people. The church was not complete without elders, and they ruled with derived authority. Cotton, in describing the relation of church members to the elders, compared them to a queen who wished to be taken on a voyage. Once she has given herself over to the sailors "shee must not rule them in steering their course, but must submit her selfe to be ruled by them, till they have brought her to her desired haven."¹⁹

For the New England Puritan, Christ had chosen to manifest his will for his church through the elders. In case the elders went badly astray, the whole people in the church exercised a power of discipline or censure. Otherwise they remained under the careful guidance of the elders. This was the context in which the magistrates and freemen were nurtured and sustained. The ministry need not depend simply on charisma to maintain its preeminence in the congregation. If the church is the primary channel through which Christ's rule for all of society is mediated, then the minister is the chosen spokesman and symbol of that channel.

The elders, or the total ministry of the church, were the most learned men in the Puritan community. They expounded the word of God, exhorted the believers, pondered the purposes of God in nature and history, provided the moral and spiritual backbone for the community, and watched over personal and public morality.

Beside the church and elders, the office of the magistrate was the other important channel through which the will of God was brought to bear in society. Because the magistrate was one of the saints he could be trusted to discern and make effective the will of God in the political realm. He did this in behalf of the church, and he did this in behalf of the total political community.

His activity in behalf of the church is clear. Thomas Hooker employed the typical Puritan term for the magistrate when he argued that as a "nursing Father" the magistrate must see to it that the church attended to the "wholesome dyet" set out in Scripture.²⁰ The Cambridge Platform asserted common Puritan convictions when it set forth the mutual dependence yet relative autonomy of the church and magistracy. It went so far as to state the magistrates' responsibility for both tables of the law.²¹ The magistrate was concerned with all the outward aspects of religion in the church and in individuals. "The end of the Magistrates office, is not only the quiet and peaceable life of the subject, in the matters of righteousness and honesty, but also in matters of godliness, yea of all godliness."²²

Thus the magistrate in the commonwealth played a special and distinct but dependent role in interpreting and mediating God's will to society in matters political. He was concerned about the exercise and consequences of all godliness, personal and public. He was to be the instrument of the fullest possible exemplification of the will of God in church and state. He had the power, if necessary, to call the churches together in synods. In fact, he played a role in relation to the freeman as citizen in the commonwealth analogous to the role of the elder in relation to the believer as a saint in the church. Both elder and magistrate derived special authority directly from the rule of Christ. This was the basis of the aristocracy in Puritan New England.²³

Just as Hooker and Cotton qualified and limited the freedom of the Christian believers in a congregation by asserting the independent Christ-given authority of the elders, so Winthrop on the same basis limited the liberty of the freeman by asserting the independent authority of the godly magistrates. In both cases covenant and consent were involved, but in both cases Christ and not natural rights or privileges was the center of covenant or consent. In the state the people had liberty in relation to the magistrates but not natural liberty, only civil or federal. This was based only on "such civil and lawful liberties, such as Christ allows you. . . ."²⁴

The Puritan theocratic ideal in its early stages in New England was clear that God did have a will for political life, that it could be known in Scripture, reason and nature, and especially in Jesus Christ, and that this will was channeled to men through the church with its covenant, through the elders, through the magistrates, and through education.

This theocratic ideal could not for long survive in practice. The demands of the world plus the abundant gifts of the new world combined with other factors to undermine the way designed by the Puritans to implement it. As the zeal died out new channels for God's will

were sought and the will itself was subject to constant reinterpretation. As long as magistrates and elders stood together the ideal could retain its form intact. Synods could be held with church and state cooperating to deal with defections and disagreement within, such as Williams and Hutchinson, or with pressures from the outside, particularly from England.

Professor Miller in his second volume on the New England mind has sketched in brilliant fashion the decline of Puritanism's original zeal and its gradual transformation of the holy experiment. The Half-Way Covenant is the admission that the means through which God makes known his will for political and social life is not as simple as was once believed. This made possible election of magistrates and freemen who had not really responded to the kingship of Christ in a profound conversion experience. It was the first deep wedge driven between the minister and the magistrates and was soon to eventuate even in a new kind of minister. Benjamin Colman was such a minister, and the Brattle Street group symbolized the new view.

The new type of magistrate and minister was also concerned about the rule of God through Christ in society, but he was convinced that God's will was encountered adequately in the laws of nature and precepts of Jesus. No public profession of faith and approval by the people of God was necessary to covenant with Christ. The Mathers reacted with grandiose proposals to stem the tide. Cotton Mather proposed in 1710 to form special Societies for the Reformation of Manners and Suppression of Vice. He found no enthusiasm except among a certain portion of the ministers. The Mathers had a little more success with their proposals to tighten discipline over laity and clergy through consociations and associations similar to presbyteries. In this way they had hoped to pick up the slack left by a relaxed magistracy and laity. In 1717 John Wise replied in his famous tract.²⁵

Wise marks the culmination of a process that started in the 1670's. Every attempt was made to pay lip service to the ideals and concept of the rulership of Christ but this was thoroughly reinterpreted from the perspective of natural law, general morality, and the ethos of Boston culture. It was to have profound consequences for the development of an American faith that carried all the terminology of the earlier Puritan ideal but operated with a different set of assumptions. Christ was now not so much something beyond New England culture, forming, transforming, and reshaping it, as Christ was to be seen as the pattern of the best that was in New England culture at present and potentially.²⁶

In actual practice, however, these two positions did not differ drastically in their immediate consequence for society or politics.²⁷

Both held to belief in a will of God for society, both believed this will was revealed in Scripture, reason, nature, and the Christ. Both believed this will was brought to bear in life through the church, the ministers, the magistrates, and the people. The Mathers wanted this under the control of the clergy and scripture as interpreted by them. The new type of magistrate and minister wanted this under the control of the magistrates interpreted through natural law and the rights of Boston freemen embodied in New England culture.

When the Great Awakening arose in New England it did much to revitalize church life and for a short time appeared capable of restoring a "gathered church." Such was not to be the case. It did succeed in elevating the rule of Christ, but this was internalized and personalized beyond the intention of the older Puritan pattern. Ministers played a new role of power, but at the same time revivalism elevated the layman. Under the conditions of a church-state establishment, renewed Christians were urged to play a more important role in political life. This they did as individuals and in so doing exhibited another break with the older Puritan pattern. The revival could not carry a sufficient proportion of the people or magistrates, and its conception of the church was not sufficiently rigorous to reinvigorate the old alliance between church, minister, and magistrate.

Religious liberty confronted the Puritan theocratic ideal with the most dangerous in a series of challenges. Previously, under the establishment, in the face of economic pressure and a deistic tendency in thought the Puritan theocratic ideal was hard pressed. Timothy Dwight was greatly worried, as were his colleagues, about the future of Christianity in America. When separation of church and state became a reality, it appeared as a mortal blow and an ignominious conclusion to the entire holy experiment. Lyman Beecher first reacted to disestablishment in Connecticut as if the church of God were about to be destroyed.²⁸ The entire Puritan dream appeared to have collapsed.

At first glance the emergence of a new national state with political and religious liberty at the center appeared to be the end of the Puritan theocratic ideal. How could Christ rule in a society where religion was deliberately cut off from the state? How were Christian values and truth to be brought to bear in the political sphere? There was absolutely no religious qualification for national magistrates, and in fact, these were not really magistrates in the Puritan sense of the term.

Furthermore, the churches faced the disastrous consequences of losing tax support at the very moment when their membership was in a lethargic state. The church had to seek new means of financial support, and new means of winning members. Without a strong church the Puritan theocratic ideal was doomed to destruction.

At this moment in American history the Puritan ideal of the rule of the saints was reconceived and revitalized to such an extent that it played a key role in American politics throughout the nineteenth century. Lyman Beecher was the leader in a group of men who reconceived this ideal in such a way that it continued on in American life, transformed but very much alive.

Beecher came to the conclusion that disestablishment or religious liberty was "the best thing that ever happened to the state of Connecticut."²⁹ The reason was that it restored the rightful rule of God in the churches and opened tremendous possibilities for new ways of actually bringing God's will to bear in American life. He had not given up the ideal, he merely transformed its mode of operation and found a more effective way of bringing it into reality.

Every facet of the Puritan ideal of the rule of the saints is present in Beecher except the changes he made in how the will of God is to be brought to bear in political-social life. A more subtle shift is to be found in the way he conceived that God's will for society was to be known. Beecher was not as Christocentric as the earlier Puritans nor as Christocentric as some of his contemporaries. But that God had a definite will for political life, that it could be known and that it was known by Christians better than anybody else—on these essential matters Lyman Beecher was in full agreement with the theocratic ideal.

In an election day sermon, after disestablishment, Beecher pointed with great pride to the Puritan conception that God has a definite will for political and social life. He says,

It was the great object of our fathers to govern men by the fear of the Lord; to exhibit the precepts, apply the motives, and realize the dispositions which the word of God inculcates and his Spirit inspires; to imbue families and schools and towns and states with this wisdom from above. . . . They hung all their hopes of civil and religious liberty upon the word of God, and the efficacy of his Spirit. . . . It was by training men for self-government, that they expected to make freemen, and, by becoming fellow workers with God, that they expected his aid in forming Christians, while, by intellectual culture, and moral influence, and divine power, they prepared men to enjoy and perpetuate civil liberty.³⁰

Not only was Beecher certain that God had a will for society and that it could be known and discerned,³¹ he knew exactly through what channels and instruments it was to be made effective. He heartily adopted religious liberty as a fruit of the earlier Puritan theocratic ideal and turned to revivalism and voluntary associations as the means to bring the word of God to bear on politics and society. Beecher pointed out that the doctrine, piety, church order, and other peculiarities of Puritan religious institutions are the real basis both of the Puritan achievements and even of contemporary achievements. "We may boast of our civil and religious liberty; but they are the fruits of other men's

labors into which we have entered, and the effect of institutions whose impulse has been felt long after the hands that reared and launched them have mouldered in the grave."³²

Beecher wanted to achieve the same goal as his forebears, but to do so he was forced to shift strategy. Even this shift he believed to be the consequence of God's providence, which further strengthened Beecher's continuity with the theocratic ideal. He pointed out that for two hundred years the religious institutions of the land were secured by law. Because of the growth of various denominations and the increase in liberty of conscience this was no longer possible. "But at the very time when the civil law had waxed old and was passing away, God began to pour out his Spirit upon the Churches, and voluntary associations of Christians arose to apply and extend that influence, which the law could no longer apply."³³

Here is the key to the transformation. God's spirit brought about the revivals to supply the manpower and zeal to bring his will to bear in society.³⁴ "Already churches look chiefly to them for their members and pastors, and for that power upon public opinion, which retards declension, gives energy to law, and voluntary support to religious institutions."³⁵ Beecher made a direct transference of channels or instruments from the old Puritan elder-magistrate, church-state arrangement to the new voluntary societies. "We are called upon to give a quickened and extended impulse to our charitable institutions. These are the providential substitutes for those legal provisions of our fathers, which are now inapplicable by change of circumstances."³⁶

Beecher named many of the societies which were so abundant during the first half of the nineteenth century. He looked to them to provide the political power, the finances, and the man-power to bring God's will to bear in America. They were concerned with personal and public morals, with education, with public issues. He was convinced that "the application of religious and moral influence is . . . the great duty to which as a nation we are called."³⁷

Above all, Beecher was determined that wherever possible public officials must be men of faith, prayer, and piety. The civil magistrate still had a special obligation to God just as for the old Puritans but "not in coercing by law attendance upon public worship, or the support of religious institutions." In manhood this all had to be preserved on one's own responsibility. To be sure the qualifications for public office were not the same as for membership in God's kingdom, nevertheless

our civil rulers owe to God and their country now, the same illustrious piety, the same estimation of God's word, the same attendance upon the ordinances of the gospel and cooperation for their support, and the same strict and pure morality, which rendered the civil fathers of our land so illustrious in their character. . . .³⁸

Lyman Beecher took back with one hand what he gave with the other. Now, in the manhood of our nation this godly role of the public official must be voluntary. We cannot make it a qualification of the law. Given this responsibility on a voluntary basis, what can the good Christian do but see to it that godly men are elected to office. This was still God's will! Beecher went on to say that the ballot-box, "suffrage," was the place where the Christian must exercise such responsibility.

The discrimination by suffrage will exert upon the youth of our country a most salutary restraint, and upon dissolute ambitious men a powerful reforming influence. Let every freeman, then, who would perpetuate the liberty and happiness of his country . . . enquire concerning the candidate for whom he is solicited to vote,—is he an enemy to the Bible, as to the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel;—is he a duellist? or an intemperate man, or a Sabbath-breaker, or dissolute, or dishonest? . . . withhold his vote and give it to a better man. . . .³⁹

Much was at stake for America, argued Beecher. Just like the original New England Puritans, he believed God had a special providence for this people and for this nation. Hence his restless activity to marshal voluntary groups to spread godliness and righteousness throughout the nation. On this basis he went west and undertook to persuade the nation of the importance of the West for the future history of mankind. Here the Puritan theocratic ideal combined with other forces to produce the manifest destiny dream of the American people. God's will for America was eventually his will for the human race. He wished to bring peace, security, prosperity, liberty, and freedom to all men through the great experiment of self-government under God. To this dream Beecher gave himself fully, but he was positive that it could be achieved only on the basis of scriptural righteousness coinciding with natural law. The will of God must rule in America if America is to fulfill her destiny.⁴⁰

So the theocratic ideal or the rule of the saints was transformed into a powerful force in American life. Recent research on the social and political ideals of the American clergy prior to the civil war demonstrates how active the clergy were in political life.⁴¹ To understand the source of these ideas, their ready reception, their structure and content, one must see them against the background of the Puritan theocratic ideal. They are then seen as a part of a complex but alive and changing pattern in American life. One can then understand far more easily the humanitarian reforms through the voluntary associations of the nineteenth century.

The theocratic ideal remained in this pattern until after the civil war. Confronted by evolution, Biblical scholarship, and the industrial revolution it again underwent a major transformation. Men such as

Lyman Abbott, Henry Ward Beecher, Washington Gladden, and Walter Rauschenbusch reformulated its tenets in the direction of the social gospel. The twentieth century witnessed its progressive secularization as it defined the will of God in terms ever more distant from Biblical insights and precepts. Nevertheless, it had sufficient energy to spark successfully a crusade for prohibition and to merge into countless political crusades concerning both foreign and domestic politics. Apparently, its influence has not yet left the American political scene nor is it likely to in the near future. For better or for worse, it is too much a part of our heritage.

1. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Irony of American History* (New York: Scribner's, 1952), p. 133.
2. Brooks Adams, *The Emancipation of Massachusetts* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1887). Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought* (3 vols., New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927-1930). Ralph Barton Perry, *Puritanism and Democracy* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1944). Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Puritan Oligarchy* (New York: Scribner's, 1947). Perry Miller, *The New England Mind* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1939). Herbert W. Schneider, *The Puritan Mind* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1930).
3. Studying Puritanism in terms of theocracy has been common practice since the first Puritan historians. They had no doubts that they lived under a theocracy and subsequent historians have agreed with them. Our intention here is to exhibit a framework of thought and even practice deeper than the external structure of the theocratic state in New England.
4. Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana, as the Ecclesiastical History of New England* (London: 1702) 2 vols. *passim*.
5. John Cotton, *A Brief Exposition... Upon the Whole Book of Ecclesiastes* (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1868), p. 122. In commenting on verse fourteen Cotton said, "There is no work, whether it be open or secret, good or evil, but God will bring it under judgment." *ibid.*, 134.
6. In his *New England Mind*, Professor Perry Miller undertakes a thorough analysis of the Puritan ambivalence with regard to God's immediate and mediate rule. It is dealt with at length in chapters 2, 3, 5, 7, 14, 15.
7. *The Savoy Declaration*, V, 1. in Wiliston Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (New York: Scribner's 1893), p. 372.
8. John Cotton, *Copy of A Letter from Mr. Cotton to Lord Say and Seal in the Year 1636*. Printed in Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston: Thomas and John Fleet, 1764) Appendix III, p. 496 f.
9. *ibid.*, 497 f.
10. John Winthrop, *Journal* ed. 1, James K. Hosmer (New York: Scribner's, 1908), II, 36.
11. John Cotton, *op. cit.*, 497. Cf. John Eliot, *The Christian Commonwealth; or, The Civil Polity of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ*. Printed in the *Massachusetts Historical Collections*, Third Series, IX, p. 144. Those who are redeemed in Christ "solemnly with the rest of God's people joyn together... receiving from the Lord both the platforme of their Civil Government, as it is set down (in the essentials of it) in the holy Scriptures..."
12. Thomas Hooker, *A Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline* (London: 1648). Preface. Cf. pt. I, 185 f.
13. *ibid.*, p. 3.
14. Cotton, J. *op. cit.*, p. 499.
15. *ibid.*
16. Hooker, *op. cit.*, pt. I, 16 Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 5 f., 185.
17. John Cotton, *The Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven* (London: 1644) pp. 65f.
18. John Cotton, *The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England* (London: 1645), p. 44.
19. Cotton, *Keyes of the Kingdom*, p. 54.
20. Hooker, T. *op. cit.*, pt. II, 80.
21. *Cambridge Platform*, XVII, 6. in Walker, W., *op. cit.*, p. 236.
22. *ibid.*
23. It is on this religious basis of the magistracy that the distinction is made between aristocracy and democracy in the Bay Colony. Cotton and Winthrop could actually maintain that they did not have a democracy even though free-men had the right to elect magistrates. It is this perspective that is not made sufficiently clear in the article by B. Katherine Brown, "A Note on the Puritan Concept of Aristocracy," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLI, 1, 195ff.
24. John Winthrop, *Speech to the General Court July 3, 1645*. Printed in P. Mil-

- ler and T. H. Johnson, *The Puritans* (New York: American Book Co., 1938) p. 207.
25. John Wise, *A Vindication of the Government of the New England Churches* (Boston: John Boyles, 1772).
 26. A penetrating and stimulating analysis of the possible ways Christianity can be related to politics and society is H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1951). Under his typology the earlier Puritans would represent the attempt to make politics and culture conform to the Christ. The position of John Wise was directed rather towards identifying the highest values of his culture with the Christ. Such a position would be called Christ of Culture. An interesting observation is that as to their sociological consequences there appears to be little difference between these two positions. The Niebuhr study is invaluable for any who wish to study the relation of Puritanism and politics.
 27. In spite of the differences between the Mathers and the Brattle Street group their similarity is pronounced in the ways they relate Christ and local culture. Though the Mathers were supposedly concerned with transforming local culture and politics through the kingship of Christ, they almost identified the will of Christ with what was achieved in Boston. To be sure this was in the past, but not in a remote past. In fact they were still living in this tradition. Cf. Mather, Cotton, *Magnalia Christi Americana*.
 28. Lyman Beecher, *Autobiography, Correspondence, Etc. of Lyman Beecher* ed., Charles Beecher (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1865) I, 344.
 29. *ibid.*
 30. Lyman Beecher, *A Sermon Addressed to the Legislature of Connecticut... on the day of the Anniversary Election, May 3d, 1826*. (New Haven: I. Bruce, 1826), pp. 9-10.
 31. See especially Beecher's "The Being of a God," "The Remedy for Dueling," "The Perils of Atheism to the Nation," "The Government of God Desirable," "A Reformation of Morals Practical and Indispensable," "The Bible a Code of Laws."
 32. Lyman Beecher, *Works* (Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., 1852), I, 334. Lecture XV, entitled "The Memory of the Fathers" is a revised and expanded edition of the 1826 election sermon. In the new edition Beecher strengthens his statements approving old Puritan religious beliefs and practices. He considers himself to be a legitimate descendant, and he is.
 33. Beecher, L., *Election Sermon* 1826, p. 11.
 34. Professor Sidney E. Mead pointed out that it was in the fight against infidelity and Unitarianism that Beecher learned the value of revivals and voluntary associations for political purposes. Cf. Mead's *Nathaniel William Taylor* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1942) pp. 74-94, 173-176. It was only after disestablishment that Beecher apparently put together the old Puritan ideal with the new church instruments.
 35. Beecher, *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 17.
 36. Beecher, L., *Works*, I, p. 335.
 37. Beecher, L., *Election Sermon*, 1826, p. 15.
 38. *ibid.*, p. 19.
 39. *ibid.*, pp. 21-22.
 40. Beecher's writings abound with this idea. In addition to the *Election Sermon*, cf. *Plea for the West, Plea for Colleges, The Building of Waste Places*.
 41. A number of recent studies have focused attention on the social-political ideas and activities of the Protestant clergy 1812-1860. Charles C. Cole, *The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists 1826-1860* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954) is an excellent survey of these ideas and provides countless leads for further investigation. Unfortunately it lacks an adequate interpretative scheme in terms of which one can understand the emergence and importance of these ideas. John R. Bodo, *The Protestant Clergy and Public Issues 1812-1848* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954) attempts to provide such a framework for his study, but it proves inadequate. He uses the concept of the theocratic pattern but vastly oversimplifies it in trying to limit it to an Old Testament legalism directly applied as God's will for the nation. He correctly notes the use of revivals and voluntary societies, but attempts to limit the concept to a Calvinistic educated clergy. As a consequence, he fails to trace the ideal from its past, note its major transformation, or understand how it can embrace men from Methodist or Lutheran as well as Presbyterian, Congregational, or Reformed churches. The finest introduction to the problem of relating Christianity and political-social life in America still remains H. Richard Niebuhr's *Kingdom of God in America* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937). He attempted to trace the entire history in terms of the rule of God first through his sovereignty, then the kingdom of Christ, and finally the coming kingdom in society.

CONTINENTAL INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT SINCE WORLD WAR I*

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM, *Yale University*

Just after the turn of the nineteenth century, the Rev. Samuel Miller, then a Presbyterian minister in New York but soon to become a professor of ecclesiastical history at the newly-founded Princeton Theological Seminary, published his ambitious *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*. He remarks in due course that "it would be improper to pass in silence the celebrated IMMANUEL KANT, Professor at Koenigsberg, in Prussia." He then goes on to comment on the "extravagant panegyrics" of Kant's disciples, but having heard "that the acutest understanding cannot tolerably comprehend [this profound and extensive system] by less than a twelve-month's study," he satisfied himself with a brief second-hand report.¹ The incident might be considered an accurate commentary on the state of "Continental influence on American Christian thought" in 1803.

Within a few years, however, the situation began to change rapidly. Young Joseph Stevens Buckminster introduced Wetstein and Griesbach's New Testament text on his appointment to the biblical lectureship at Harvard in 1811 and he hastened his premature death through incessant study of the new German critical literature. A year later (in 1812) Moses Stuart exchanged his New Haven pulpit for the professorship of sacred literature at Andover and immediately discovered the same need as Buckminster. By 1825 a knowledge of the German language had become a recognized scholarly necessity. Meanwhile a quintet of Harvard graduates—Ticknor, Cogswell, Everett, Bancroft, and Hedge—had begun the great movement of American students to the German universities. When a century had passed, ten thousand would have followed suit. Professor Tholuck at Halle would be able to count among his former students such diverse leaders in their respective denominations as the Old School Presbyterian, Charles Hodge, the Liberal Congregationalist, Newman Smyth, and the Unitarian Social-Gospeller, Francis G. Peabody. Professor Pochmann in nearly a thousand pages can only brush the surface of just the "literary and philosophical" influences in the nineteenth century; whereas he could treat of the preceding centuries in less than fifty pages.²

As one ponders this sweeping invasion of America's intellectual life—an invasion that left almost no branch of learning unaffected, and which profoundly altered the methods and structure of the institutions of learning themselves (from *Kindergarten* to the graduate seminar),

*A paper read before the American Society of Church History, in New York, December 27, 1957.

as one couples these with the mediating influences of French thinkers like Cousin and Jouffroy or British romantics like Carlyle and Coleridge, as one reflects on the course of American religious thought from the Transcendentalists and Bushnell to latter-day idealists of the Bowne-Howison-Royce generation—it becomes apparent that the First World War cannot possibly have more than transitional significance to the subject at hand. Preparatory to some precisions on the nature of this transition, however, it would be well to consider the broad denominational context in which Continental influence played its rôle.

I

In the American churches of the twentieth century, it is apparent at the outset that there are two vast currents of belief and practice that are completely outside our purview. One of these is frequently referred to as *Fundamentalism*, which term I wish to limit *strictly* to those large areas of America's church-membership which for economic, social, and ecclesiastical reasons in general and an exaggerated emphasis on revivalism in particular became almost totally estranged from the on-going intellectual enterprise of the Atlantic community during the nineteenth century. (Without this estrangement and ignorance and its attendant insecurity and hostility, there is no "Fundamentalism" by my definition of the word.)³ The other vast current is that popular piety usually associated with Norman Vincent Peale but more properly defined as religious utilitarianism. The essence of the movement is its stress on the usefulness of belief, faith, and religion (or religiosity) for success, peace of mind, confidence, social security, patriotism, respectability, freedom from worry, etc. *ad. inf.*⁴ These two currents or movements, if combined, must almost certainly include at least half of America's Christian non-Roman Catholic church-membership. Neither movement, moreover, is a recent phenomenon. The first three decades of this century were the hey-day of organized Fundamentalism. During the same period the popular sooth-sayer, Orison Swett Marden, loomed almost as large on the horizon as Peale does now, and Tocqueville thought that religious utilitarianism dominated the American pulpit already in the 1830's. These two movements, therefore, can serve admirably as brackets to frame the particular concern of the present essay.

Within these brackets, however, one can descry three interlaced tendencies in marked distinction to the above-described movements. First of all, is a large group of American churches whose intellectual tradition and institutional roots *are* Continental. Most obviously falling in this category are the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and certain of the Reformed churches, though certain more "sectarian" groups such as the Hutterites and Mennonites could also be included. Con-

tinental influences were obviously of major importance to most of these groups but to limit the scope of an already too-broad essay, I am arbitrarily leaving them aside from my central concern.⁵

On one side of this "Continental group" (and I shall abstain from saying Right or Left because the terms do not apply) there is an older conformation of denominations whose roots are primarily British. They are, moreover, constitutive of that broad tradition of "American Evangelical Protestantism" which Ralph Henry Gabriel, Sidney E. Mead, W. W. Sweet, and others have done so much to clarify as a fairly unified American religious outlook.⁶ Revivalism provided the groundwork of this group's thought and practice; the westward movement and the free expansive spirit of American democracy provided its formative ethos. Its theological base was Reformed, but its development tended to be Arminian and in the direction of the so-called "Radical" Reformation.

This tradition came more and more to be characterized by a deep anti-doctrinal, anti-intellectual, and anti-liturgical bias. That this tendency invaded American Presbyterianism and involved it in a series of bitter crises during the nineteenth century is a familiar matter of record. The challenge of "American Lutheranism," which for a time created something of a "crisis" in American Lutheran theology, reflected a similar invasion. The same forces served in a small way to sharpen the cleavage between Evangelical and Tractarian Episcopalians. Its "home" *par excellence* was among the Baptists, Methodists, Disciples and a large block of Presbyterians. We may say, therefore, that a broad movement, primarily British in its orientation, took a dominant place in the American church-picture, and that this movement, except for somewhat distant influences from German Pietism, stood rather remote from developments in the churches of the European continent.

During the last hundred years, however, these denominations have shown a marked willingness to absorb influences of Continental origin that postdate the Age of the Reformation or its scholastic aftermath. Broadly speaking this "absorption" took place in two stages. The first came primarily in the nineteenth century due to the widespread disenchantment of many important theologians and churchmen with the revivalistic tradition as such. Especially among urban churches in the northern and north-eastern parts of the country and led by seminary professors in these areas, there was a large movement of individuals and ultimately of nearly entire denominations into a "Liberal" movement which was drawing heavy sustenance from the Continent. The second stage was featured by a twentieth century receptivity to Continental *criticism* of this Continentally-inspired Liberalism.

The third grouping within the bracket is suggested by the above-described process: it consists of that movement which has a defection from revivalistic conservatism as an early part of its heritage, Liberalism as a long second phase, and a period of anxious questioning of the Liberal heritage as a third phase. The names "Neo-Orthodox" and "Neo-Liberal" have often been used to designate this loosely defined conformation. These labels have been so loaded with pejorative intent, however, that neither has much utility; but taken together they do suggest one important fact about the group: that it includes men with a great diversity of views. Some of them undoubtedly still stand on the older Liberal statement of the religious problem; others have much more thoroughly re-oriented their thinking. Beneath this diversity there is nevertheless a characteristic of the men in this group which is of special significance to the present essay, namely, their having almost invariably experienced a serious or radical *bouleversement* in their religious thinking. *They personify a transition in American theology.* Moreover, because they often had backgrounds in "American Evangelical Protestant" denominations they had an entrée to a very important "audience."

Of "Liberalism" *per se* I shall say very little. Expositions of both a contemporary and a retrospective nature abound.⁷ Suffice it to say that industrialism and the rise of the city brought into being a socio-economic theater of action; sensational advances in natural science (notably evolutionary theories in geology and biology) created new issues; and historico-critical inroads rendered traditional Scriptural defenses obsolescent. The response to this triple-challenge was a "New Theology" which can without injustice be seen as a fairly structured phenomenon. Five of its major themes merit enumeration simply because twentieth-century influence would bring each of them under attack:

(1) With regard to human nature, an emphasis on man's natural freedom and natural capacity for altruism; inversely stated, a drastic revision of historic doctrines of original sin and human depravity.

(2) A consequent emphasis on ethical preaching and moral education as the essential functions of the Church and its ministry. Inversely, this involved a de-emphasis of ecclesiology as such, and a disinterest in questions of church order, the sacraments, and worship. This did not mean that Liberals automatically became "Social Gospellers." Winthrop Hudson very justifiably refers to Rauschenbusch as "a lonely prophet" and during the nineteenth century at least (that is during the hey-day of Liberalism) the advocates of "social Christianity" were a small minority.

(3) Related to the revised estimate of human nature and the popu-

larity of evolutionary doctrines, a fervent advocacy of an idea of progress that was far more dynamic and optimistic than that entertained during the Enlightenment.

(4) An evolutionary and historically-oriented revision of the idea of revelation and a complementary emphasis on religious experience, the feeling of dependence, or the moral sense as being the true seats of religious authority.

(5) A wide and variegated movement away from the strict dualisms of Orthodoxy. Uniting both romantic and Darwinian tendencies, they tended to emphasize the unity of man and nature. Man and God were likewise brought together by pantheistic arguments or by strongly stated doctrines of the divine immanence. Finally the ancient disjunctions between the subjective and objective worlds, between mind and matter, were often minimized by an emphasis on the primacy of will, idea, or consciousness. Not all Liberals by any means believed that metaphysical questions were central, but when they did, they tended strongly in an idealistic and subjectivistic direction.

The Liberal movement in American theology reached its high-water mark in the first two decades of the twentieth century. By 1920 the Social Gospel movement had also finally come into its own, with the Federal Council of Churches as a fairly sturdy monument to its energy and acceptance. But in both cases the stagnancy that comes when the tide ceases to run was apparent. The stalemated situation of the "Fundamentalist controversy" made matters worse. With the possible exception of the great religious depression of the Revolutionary epoch (1770-1800), there was probably never a time in American history when less heed was paid to the message of the churches. At no time did it so deserve to be ignored.⁸

As one views this situation of the 'Twenties' in retrospect, it appears that the First World War itself had been by no means the decisive event that many historians have indicated. It had been a shock, no doubt, a disturbing interruption; but its effects seem to have been temporary and slight. The churches, for one thing, had participated in the military and patriotic propaganda with such an appalling lack of discrimination, that they had to regard the war as theirs as much as anyone else's. Anyway it was a Great Crusade; and a world made safe for democracy seemed worth the price. For America, moreover, the price was relatively cheap. Men who had actually seen combat became a kind of elite corps in the veterans' organizations. Compared to Germany and France, the United States emerged unscathed. Liberalism, like America in general, continued to speak in the old way as if nothing much had happened. Overhead the banner of Normalcy fluttered listlessly.

II

It was not so in Europe. Indeed, to perceptive minds the handwriting on the wall for bourgeois complacency and *Kulturprotestantismus* had long been visible. And from the start there was a profound and prophetically Christian element in this penetrating critique. As the crisis deepened with the passing decades it became increasingly apparent to acute Continental observers that Western culture and civilization were indeed "between the times." In the pages which follow, I am going to argue that the most significant points of contact or bridges between this profoundly altered theological situation on the Continent and America's post-liberal thinking were four in number: (1) A new movement in biblical exegesis and interpretation; (2) the German social-Christian movement; (3) the Swedish movement in theology, often spoken of as Lundensian; and (4) the "crisis theology" or dialectical school associated with Barth. Each of these movements bore enormously fruitful results during the post-war decades and necessarily I shall recur to them. But one must first take slight cognizance of the half-century or more of *Drang und Sturm* during which a temper that was at first only a kind of isolated and underground protest voiced by a Kierkegaard, a Schopenhauer, or a Dostoijski becomes an increasingly prominent note in Continental thinking.

Very much to the point are the acute observations of Jacob Burckhardt, who already during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 saw the advent of an age of iron men.

I have a premonition [he wrote to a friend in 1871] which sounds like utter folly and yet which positively will not leave me; the military state must become one great factory. Those hordes of men in the great industrial centers will not be left indefinitely to their greed and want. What must logically come is a fixed and supervised stint of misery, glorified by promotions and uniforms, daily begun and ended to the sound of drums. . . . Long voluntary subjections under individual *Fuehrers* and usurpers is in prospect. . . . For this reason authority will again raise its head in the pleasant twentieth century, and a terrible head.⁹

Young Friedrich Nietzsche heard the Burckhardtian warning, and read the signs of the times with an even deeper determination to shed its superficialities. The transvaluation of morals that he called for like a prophet of old was simply one way of expressing his revulsion for the placid and pious acceptances he saw around him. He stands at a many-pronged fork in the road where several otherwise diverse men and movements could look back to him gratefully.

Right in Basel would be "that man, Overbeck" (Barth) who with the long perspective of a church-historian would point to the tragic conflation of "Christendom and Culture" in the contemporary world.¹⁰ In Vienna the "Wiener Kreis" would cite Nietzsche's positivism as a milestone on the way to their own thoroughgoing attack on "School

Philosophy." In 1918 Ludwig Wittgenstein would sign the preface of his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* with its persuasive critique of the riddle-makers and the askers of unanswerable (and therefore logically unaskable) questions.¹¹ The intellectual asceticism demanded by a more rigorous generation of Neo-Kantians added another dimension to the rising critique of bourgeois ideologies whether secular or religious. To this impulse was added a new and more radically existential critique, sounded by Unamuno in Spain (1912, *The Tragic Sense of Life*) and by Gabriel Marcel in France, but also reminiscent of Nietzsche. This trend was facilitated particularly by the appearance of Kierkegaard's *Works* in German translation in the pre-war decade.¹² Nor can one neglect to mention the appearance just at the War's end of Oswald Spengler's dramatic "demonstration" that the Faustian civilization of the West was merely dragging to its close in a wintertime of caesarism.

Yet all this ferment had a specifically Christian corollary, as mention of Kierkegaard and Overbeck has already suggested. The event which, to me, best signalizes this fact is Albert Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1906) with its resounding judgment that a century of European biblical scholarship, for all of its brilliance and ingenuity, was a colossal failure. The typical bourgeois New Testament historian, in the image Schweitzer suggests, was merely peering down a 2000-year-long well-shaft, seeing his own face reflected in the water, and calling it Jesus. What Schweitzer perceived, on the other hand, was not an easily understood moral Teacher but the Messiah, the Christ, whose words of the coming Kingdom required a radical eschatological interpretation.¹³ Schweitzer, in a sense, founded a school of biblical interpretation which he never joined; but he can be taken as a symbol for a tendency toward more seriously evangelical exegesis. Due to other theological influences shortly to be discussed, this "exegetical revival" became a powerful factor both in deepening the changed religious temper and in communicating it to America.¹⁴

Another sort of disenchantment with the prevailing church-situation (also anticipated from the outside by Burckhardt) expressed itself in social terms, often with heavily Marxian accents. It proclaimed the bankruptcy of capitalist civilization, the hopeless blindness of the bourgeoisie, the tragic involvement of the Church in this diseased structure, and the uncritical participation of Christian thinkers in the prevailing ideology. When at its vital best, this party (if I may call it that) brought to the socialist outlook a profoundly evangelical and existential deepening that made it a very different thing from earlier nineteenth-century varieties of Christian socialism whether British or Continental, and a very remote thing from the standard forms of the

Social Gospel in America. Georg Wünsch's *Wirklichkeitschristentum* (1932) was one extremely important statement of the movement's aspirations; but Paul Tillich is the figure that Americans are most likely to recognize, though his emphasis on idealistic motifs and ontological concerns made him somewhat atypical.

The "Luther Renaissance" in German and Scandinavian scholarship, along with very vital theological accompaniments, was another movement of major significance to the present theme. In Germany this interest was perhaps best represented by the intensive researches and forceful expression of Karl Holl of Berlin and the more theologically oriented yet exceedingly diverse labors of Werner Elert of Erlangen. In Sweden these trends took on even greater importance, with Einar Billing's *Luther's Doctrine of the State* of 1900 serving to indicate the vintage of the movement. Most prominent, perhaps, were the works of Anders Nygren, Gustaf Aulén, and Yngve Brilioth, but there were many others. Because this scholarship has never been divorced from a concern for theological reconstruction and church-reform, moreover, Swedish theology provided a constant ferment during the era of transition, especially through its insistence that Christian theology and ethics be grounded in an understanding of God's self-giving love and of Christ's victory over sin, death and the devil.

One man, however, succeeded beyond all others in impressing the evangelical message, as well as the need for it, into the heart, conscience, and mind of the Continental churches. This was Karl Barth, who exploded his *Römerbrief* "on the playground of the theologians" in 1918, and again in 1921 through an expanded yet tightened version. He was a man "driven on," as he said, "till I stand with nothing before me but the enigma of the matter . . . till I know the author so well that I allow him to speak in my name. . ." What he proclaimed was man's dependence—but, with the opposite implication from Schleiermacher, also God's utter transcendence. Yet when he "broke out of his egg-shells," it was a *Church* dogmatics that he began to propound, not some new hyper-individualism. The opposition, of course, was strident; but men like Thurneysen, Gogarten, Brunner and Merz augmented the "dialectical" or "crisis" theology forcefully. It became a major conditioning factor on the Christian thought of Europe. It was from this quarter, too, that there came the peremptory—and not exactly tactful—demand that "America must listen." America did listen, though sometimes rather belatedly, and always rather selectively. And the response is worth our attention.¹⁵

III

John Mackay, born in Scotland and now soon retiring as President of Princeton Theological Seminary, was one of those who heard. Coming within the circle of Unamuno's influence in Spain, he became consumed by a desire for a deeper knowledge of Kierkegaard, and during those years that brought him to Barth. Perhaps more symbolic of Continental influence in America is an event which almost deserves an anniversary celebration. I refer to the afternoon that a neighboring minister wandered into the Harvard Divinity School library—and while looking over the new-book shelf came across Barth's collection of essays, *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*. The immediate effect of the discovery was his being held transfixed by the message he confronted. He stood there while the afternoon waned. The secondary effect was his determination to translate these commanding words. This he did, and in 1928 the first volume of Barth in English appeared.¹⁶ Since then Douglas Horton has played a wide and influential role in the Church, being at present Dean of the Harvard Divinity School and Chairman of the Faith and Order Commission; but his work of thirty years ago marks an era in American Christian thought.

Another form of contact, obviously enough, came through Europeans coming to America either as visitors on repeated ecumenical missions, like Adolphe Keller (who also contributed a highly significant volume on *Karl Barth and Christian Unity*, translated in 1933) or permanently, like Wilhelm Pauck, whose volume on Barth was the first American exposition to be published. Paul Tillich also began an enormously influential career at Union Theological Seminary in 1933, after having had his thinking on *The Religious Situation* heralded the previous year through a translation made by H. Richard Niebuhr.¹⁷

The year 1932 was made memorable in another way by Reinhold Niebuhr's first important book, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. Like Tillich's *Religious Situation* the book is permeated by Marxian categories, though it is a good deal less permeated than Tillich's by what Marx would certainly have designated as "German ideology." Its analysis and ethical argument is essentially secular, with the result that its thesis could be accepted, as Morton G. White keeps telling us, by the "Atheists for Niebuhr" with quite as much enthusiasm as by Christian realists. Yet it was undoubtedly the chief religio-ethical bombshell of domestic construction that has fallen in twentieth century America. Possibly it is a document of "chastened Liberalism," but it is more chastened and less Liberal than anything Reinhold Niebuhr had yet said.

Nor are we yet through with 1932, for in that year also appeared a major American exposition of the new developments in Continental theology. This is Walter Lowrie's manifesto, perhaps best described in a few words by quoting the full title: *OUR CONCERN WITH THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS, The Fundamental Aspects of the Dialectical Theology Associated with the Name of Karl Barth, Appreciatively Presented with the Query Whether It Be Not Our Only Positive Possibility, The Crisis of Society and of the Church Understood as the Crisis of the Individual before God*. A valuable feature of the volume is its bibliography, which provides an interesting commentary on the pertinent literature then available. Many trenchant and powerful volumes of Continental theology are listed—works by Brunner, Gogarten, Heim, Bultmann, Tillich, and others—and fifty-six titles in German on Kierkegaard as well as Kierkegaard's Collected Works, also in German. (It is interesting that the Scandinavian languages are still Greek to this man who was to become best remembered as one of S. K.'s chief translators). The only Kierkegaard in English is a little group of selections published obscurely in 1923 by Professor L. M. Hollander in a University of Texas Bulletin; and the only English article cited is by David L. Swenson of the University of Minnesota who, together with Lowrie and a few others, was in succeeding years to make the whole Kierkegaardian *corpus* available to American readers.¹⁸

To further highlight the significance of 1932 (the year of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's election, let us also bear in mind) Joseph Haroutunian published his *Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology*. To what degree his work reflects Continental influence, I do not know; but the book may be considered the opening gun in a long, still incomplete campaign to recover the American Puritan and Edwardsean traditions from the obloquy and oblivion into which they had fallen. It would be followed in 1933 by the first of Perry Miller's massive tomes on the New England Mind (*Orthodoxy in Massachusetts*), and would become a part of a still larger reassessment of America's literary heritage that would rescue Hawthorne from the genteel tradition and put Melville back in the canon.

Yet it is not 1932 but 1934 (the first year of Hitler's Third Reich) that I would designate as the *annus mirabilis* of the movement here being chronicled. For one thing (perhaps I should say, in the first place), a volume of Karl Barth's sermons appeared, translated and edited by George W. Richards of the German Reformed Seminary in Lancaster, Pa., and Elmer George Homrighausen, then a pastor in Indianapolis.¹⁹ This was important since, as Barth had said, it was the "familiar situation of the minister on Saturday night" that in his case

had "crystallized . . . into a marginal note to all theology." Richards also helped make the year memorable with a more substantive contribution, his comprehensive book, *Beyond Fundamentalism and Modernism, The Gospel of God*. He had already said in 1928 that "only an act of omnipotent grace can turn the American philosopher and theologian from the method of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Troeltsch to the way of Kierkegaard and Barth."²⁰ Now he resolved to do his part toward bringing about that turn. In a wide-ranging discussion that shows considerable influence from Spengler, Dilthey, Carl Becker, and Schweitzer, as well as the Continental 'Luther Renaissance,' he called the Church back to its calling.

An even sharper blast of the same year was the *Christian Manifesto* of Edwin Lewis, then a professor at Drew University. He had aroused Methodist fury the year before in an article on "The Fatal Apostasy of the Modern Church." Now, with the exception of one chapter, he directed a book to the American churches at large. "We are called to a new crusade," he declared, and through a series of remarkably incisive chapters he prepared the ground for the reaffirmation of the historic witness of the Church that he felt necessary.²¹

Walter Marshall Horton's *Realistic Theology* was another event in this remarkable year; and his account of the Liberal failure was especially effective because of the very specific historical application to the American scene which he provided. The book also dwells with very considerable cogency on the problem of the Church, which during these very years the various strands of the ecumenical movement were bringing to the fore with increasing intensity. At this point, Horton found the American situation to be at its worst; and he accused Liberals of having watered-down their conception of the Church until it "reminds one much more of a stolid group of Stoics or an esoteric bank of Neo-Platonists listening to an eminent pagan philosopher, than it reminds one of early Christians assembled for a love feast."²²

Most important of all the men who made 1934 memorable is Reinhold Niebuhr, who in that year made not one but two contributions, though the first (*Reflections on the End of an Era*) is really little more than an extension of his earlier critique. In the Rauschenbusch Lectures (delivered at Colgate-Rochester Seminary and in 1935 published as *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*), however, a new note is sounded. Here his thought really comes to pivot on evangelical principle. (Others have said this change occurs only in the Gifford Lectures; others have said later; still others have implied that it has never occurred. But the issue can for my purpose be sidestepped.) There is no doubt whatever that these lectures provided an enormously influential point of departure for American thinking on Christian so-

cial ethics. A brief quotation makes clear the brunt of the lectures' message:

The ethic of Jesus is the perfect fruit of prophetic religion. Its ideal of love has the same relation to the facts and necessities of human experience as the God of prophetic faith has to the world. . . . It transcends the possibilities of human life in its final pinnacle as God transcends the world. . . .²³

To continue the narrative so far carried through the year 1934 is impossible here in anything but the most general terms. The prime fact of the matter is that a wide and extremely influential group of religious thinkers had made a re-entry into what Barth called "the strange new world of the Bible." In 1939 a memorable series of autobiographical articles in *The Christian Century* documented how the preceding decade had shaken the theological world. The next two decades witnessed a deeper entry still, with the hammer-blows of the Second World War and a decade of precarious peace sobering the entire process. Participation in the world ecumenical movement has accentuated the process with the result, in turn, that Americans have taken an increasingly significant rôle in its deliberations. Concomitantly, communication with the continentally-rooted and confessionally-oriented traditions in the United States has been opened.

At the same time the intellectual or theological currents suggested by the *bouleversement* of 1932-34 have continued to flow. Disinterested historical positivism has ceased to dominate biblical study. Old Testament scholarship has returned from its exile in the departments of Near Eastern studies and comparative religion. Thinking on Christian education has been drastically reoriented in principle and applied in practice.²⁴ The problems of church-membership, the sacramental life and the objective, doctrinal witness of the Church have been re-enlivened in denominational and in interdenominational seminaries alike. As a result it might be said that an army has at least been put in the field to combat the Pious Utilitarianism that still dominates the nation's religious life. No less significantly, it is being discovered on the opposite side of the field that the old Modernist-Fundamentalist *impasse* can be transcended. Communications are, in fact, being restored, though in this realm, too, the main work still lies ahead and its success is constantly threatened from both sides by journalistic excesses that feed upon old fears and suspicions.²⁵

IV

At this point my narrative must be concluded in order that a basic question may be posed: to what extent when we assess the substantive aspects of the changing American situation can we speak of Continental influence?

A proper answer would begin with an essay on the anatomy of influence, but since that is impossible, I will only make the observation that "influence" can be of two sorts, *persuasive* and *provocative*, which often interlace in a complex way. Marxism, for example, can be persuasive—and its influence on religious thought has been considerable. But the propaganda of institutionalized Marxism as one has had it in the Soviet Union is often not persuasive but provocative. To some men in the 1930's the official rationalizations of the great Russian purge trials had a provocative effect that undid what the persuasiveness of Marx had accomplished. France's Ellingwood Abbot, an American scientific theist of the nineteenth century, on whom I did my doctoral dissertation, was persuaded in the pre-Civil War years by the romantic, moralistic naturalism of William Cullen Bryant; he was provoked by Darwin's *Origin of Species* into turning his thought down an entirely different theological channel. Both forces were influential, but one went with the grain, the other against it. In a more obvious sense, historical events (like wars) or natural catastrophes (like the Lisbon earth-quake) can be provocative.

In this theoretical context I would say that catastrophic historical events did far more to provoke new attitudes in the minds of Continental thinkers in the period concerning us than they did in America. At all events, the provocation came much sooner and much more brutally to the Europeans. As a result they developed an experiential background, an insight, a vocabulary, a method of discourse, and a sense of urgency that made them extraordinarily persuasive as the crisis of the twentieth century deepened. American provocations, on the contrary, did not mount up sufficiently until the late 'Twenties' and early 'Thirties.' Crisis theology until that time could be ignored like other ugly rumors or else it could be regarded as a veritable natural catastrophe from which America had happily been spared. It was only when the failures of the Peace, the enormities of the Russian experiment, the savage behavior of the Nazis, and economic breakdown were added to intellectual and cultural problems that Americans were in a position to be persuaded. Even then the milder voices were most appealing.

One can feel fairly assured, nevertheless, that persuasion would have been still longer delayed had it not been for another fact of vast significance, namely, that Americans really *were* in contact with Continental intellectual developments. Put otherwise, the transition was not abrupt because so many thinkers had participated in the ongoing process. What Americans so often did was exchange one set of Continental influences for another. The case of George Richards is typical: one part of his life was dominated by the thought of Schleiermacher,

Ritschl and Troeltsch, the latter part by Kierkegaard and Barth. In a thinker like H. Richard Niebuhr, the Troeltschian strain is a continuous uniting factor, as apparent in his early *Social Sources* as in his *Christ and Culture*. If, contrary to the fact, one could imagine all America's intellectual ties as having been exclusively English down to World War I, then the events of the 'Thirties' would be very hard to imagine. But such was not the case. If I may speak like an Hegelian for a moment, the Atlantic ocean had little effect on the inner dialectic of Liberalism. Surfeit was international and interlocked.

This fact points, in turn, to a problem of national character. Do not Americans show a propensity for the thinking that has characterized the Germanic intellectual community (Alsatian, Swiss, German, and Scandinavian)? In the colonial period, of course, we were a cultural province of Great Britain, and not even the cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment nor our dalliance with French ideas during the Revolutionary epoch changed that situation until after the War of 1812. Since that "Second War of Independence," however, and since the age of nationalistic cultural awakening when Channing, Bryant, and Emerson were voicing their demands for independent American thinking and writing, the picture has drastically changed. Even the American soldier and tourist reveal the propensity. What tips the scales, moreover, seems to be something more basic than an attraction to mere cleanliness, efficiency, good plumbing and fine beer: there is an underlying element of temperament that has made the German-American intellectual relationship so close. An American without that intellectual affinity is difficult to imagine; and I venture to say that no explanation of the theological transformation of the last three or four decades can be adequate unless it takes account of this fact.

Two qualifications must be made, however. The first has to do with the impossibility of conceiving twentieth-century Western civilization apart from its debt to the "German renaissance of the nineteenth century." As well try to conceive sixteenth-century Europe without the Italian *Quattrocento*. The other has to do with the American past itself, as Bishop Bayne, and more recently Sidney Mead, have reminded us with regard to Abraham Lincoln;²⁶ or as a great many other critics and historians have indicated with regard to Hawthorne, Melville, Henry Adams, and William James, not to mention Edwards and the Puritans. There are certain very durable *native* foundations for post-liberal thinking to rest on.

In conclusion I would like merely to venture three generalizations regarding the Continental influences which came to bear on America after World War I and which after a decade or so of percolation began to seep into the American religious consciousness.

The first is perhaps too obvious to deserve elaboration: that dissatisfaction with bourgeois civilization, ranging from the fairly superficial petulance of Sinclair Lewis through feelings of profoundest despair, played a very important role in the early developments. Of course, tragedy itself, of a depth and pervasiveness unknown before then, was the Continental catalyst which America could not—and possibly still cannot—provide, because total national, collective tragedy has not been part of her experience. But anxiety over denials and contradictions of the American ideal there was.

The second generalization has to do with the almost irresistible impulse to characterize this Continental influence with some fairly unified concept that would embrace both its secular and its religious aspects. In yielding to this impulse I must say that I can find no other adjective so rewarding as "Kierkegaardian." No one else suggests the anguished search for relevant Christianity or the desire for Christians who can speak a prophetic word as does Kierkegaard. Nobody else so well suggests the movement's determined effort to plumb the realities of human experience, human sin, and human despair. Nobody could have schooled Unamuno better for speaking of the tragic sense of life. Nobody could have schooled Barth better about the absolute distinction between time and eternity. No Marxian pointed to the complacency of European intellectual life more relentlessly. No positivist chastised the vagrancy of School Philosophy more pointedly. And so one could go on. The basic character of the Continental impulse which created so profound a reversal in the trend of Christian thinking in the 'Thirties' was Kierkegaardian. I am not saying it was the influence of Kierkegaard himself. Nietzsche did not need the Gloomy Dane to be Nietzsche. Neither did Burckhardt, or Nygren, or Overbeck, or Barth, in order that they be themselves. Perhaps not even Heidegger, Jaspers, Bultmann, Marcel or Sartre needed Kierkegaard in that sense. Moreover, it is necessary to observe that the areas of biblical theology and ecclesiology, which have become increasingly important since 1935, do not have a great place in Kierkegaardian thought. But somehow I find it harder to drop him out of the picture than any other nineteenth-century or twentieth-century figure when trying to comment on the character of the process under discussion.

My final remark is the anti-climactical insistence that no single unitary concept used to characterize a whole movement of intellectual and spiritual transition can be allowed to obscure the basic diversity of the influences that come within that unifying concept. The tension between Tillichian and Barthian views that one senses in so much contemporary American theological discussion points to this diversity. The tensions between churchly orientations of thought as against more

individualistic-existential emphases point to other diversities that remain even when we grant that each has been much influenced by the other. In sacramental theology other major differences come to the surface; and even more significant are those that bear on the objective aspects of the Church's witness in Scripture and Creed. To get very close to home, problems of church-history and tradition show the same polarities. But all of this, of course, is but another way of saying that the influences have been rich and profound and significant for America in ways beyond the powers of a single essay—or this essayist—to express.

1. *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1803), II, pp. 22 ff.
2. Henry A. Pochmann, *German Culture in America, 1600-1900: Philosophical and Literary*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957) surveys the men and events here mentioned and many more, with much bibliographical support. See also Stanley M. Vogel, *German Literary Influences on the American Transcendentalists* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955).
3. Obviously no term like "Fundamentalist" ever has a single, definite, invariable, agreed-upon meaning. Because this term is so often used with pejorative connotations, however, I have purposely delimited its application. My sharply restricted use of the name reflects a conviction that the Fundamentalist movement should be understood as the historically-rooted obverse of the Liberal-Modernist movement and that no form of theological "conservatism" is *ipso facto* "Fundamentalist." Accordingly I exclude Jonathan Edwards, Charles Hodge, and J. Gresham Machen as well as contemporary theologians like Van Til, Berkouwer, Carnell *et al.*, who are frequently referred to as Fundamentalists, or even so refer to themselves. To my mind, a person is not a Fundamentalist if he speaks to the issues, is aware of the problems, is well-informed, and is in communication with those from whom he dissents. I recognize that nobody can legislate the meaning of such a word; I merely wish to emphasize an important qualitative distinction between two types of conservatism.
4. I have described this Pious Utilitarianism more fully in *The Pieties of Usefulness*, Bulletin of Stetson University, DeLand, Florida, 1957, and in "The Levels of Religious Revival," *Confluence*, IV (April, 1955), 32-43.
5. Ernest B. Koenker's *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (University of Chicago Press, 1954) suggests one aspect of the subject which is here being left aside. Theological changes in the Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches of America are likewise not specifically considered, though both were much affected by the general tendencies which will be my primary concern.
6. Ralph Henry Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought*, rev. ed. (New York: Ronald Press, 1956); Sidney E. Mead, "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America, 1607-1850," in H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams (eds.), *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives* (New York: Harpers, 1956) and several other important essays there cited. Sweet's lifetime corpus might be seen as variations on this theme. Ronald E. Osborn, *The Spirit of American Christianity* (New York: Harpers, 1958) reflects even as it explains the phenomenon.
7. On "Neo-Orthodoxy" and Liberalism the literature is too vast to need references here; but see the surveys by John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity* (New York: Scribners, 1955); Daniel D. Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (New York: Harpers, 1952); Hans Frei, "Niebuhr's Theological Background," in Paul Ramsay (ed.), *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr* (New York: Harpers, 1957); and possibly my own "Neo - Orthodoxy Demythologized," *Christian Century*, May 22, 1957.
8. See Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harpers, 1949); Paul A. Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954). To my knowledge there is no adequate book on the American churches of "Only Yesterday."
9. Quoted from Burckhardt's published

- letters by Karl Löwith, *Meaning In History* (University of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 24. See also James H. Nichols, "Introduction" to Burekhardt's essays: *Force and Freedom, A Interpretation of History* (New York: Meridian, 1955); and also ch. xiii therein.
10. Franz Overbeck (1837-1905), *Christentum und Kultur*, C. A. Bernoulli, ed. (Basel, 1919).
 11. No historical work I know of does justice to the great significance for theology of logical positivism, logical empiricism, and the various schools of philosophical analysis which the various phases of Wittgenstein's thought merely serve to suggest. See Jose Ferrater Mora, "Wittgenstein, A Symbol of Troubled Times," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, XIV (Sept., 1953), 89-96. For summaries and bibliographies see Herbert Feigl, "Logical Empiricism," in Dagobert D. Runes (ed.), *Twentieth Century Philosophy* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947). The theological literature in this area of concern is, of course, large and growing; see John Hick, *Faith and Knowledge* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1957); E. L. Mascall, *Words and Images* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1957), etc., and works there cited.
 12. F. H. Heinemann, *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament* (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1958) contains a useful and up-to-date bibliography of the chief primary and secondary works as well as of other bibliographies.
 13. Schweitzer's *Paul and his Interpreters* (1st German edition, 1912) complemented the *Quest*; but already he was in training for his new vocation as a medical missionary. See his *Out of my Life and Thought* (New York: Holt, 1933; Mentor Book edition, 1953), esp. ch. x.
 14. The new evangelical temper in New Testament exegesis and scholarship was probably best represented and advanced during the 'Twenties' and early 'Thirties' by Martin Dibelius, Rudolf Bultmann, and Karl Ludwig Schmidt.
 15. See especially Tillich's *The Religious Situation*, H. Richard Niebuhr, tr. (New York: Meridian-Living Age, 1956) and *The Protestant Era*, James Luther Adams, tr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948; Phoenix edition, 1957). Major mediating works on Swedish theology were Nels Ferré, *Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology* (New York: Harpers, 1939) and Edgar M. Carlson, *The Reinterpretation of Luther* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1948). Probably no American book caught the spirit of the early Barthian movement better than Wilhelm Pauck's *Karl Barth* (New York: Harpers, 1931). In 1933 Barth's *Romans* appeared in English (Oxford).
 16. *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1928; New York: Harper Torchbook, 1957), the latter edition with a new Foreword.
 17. A year before, in an essay on "Religious Realism and the Twentieth Century," in Douglas C. Macintosh (ed.), *Religious Realism* (New York: Macmillan, 1913) that could almost have been published as an introduction to Tillich's *The Religious Situation*, Niebuhr made clear that Continental "realism" could very relevantly be brought to bear on the American scene. Indeed his own *Social Sources of Denominationalism* of 1929 (New York: Meridian-Living Age, 1957) had already made or implied much of its criticism.
 18. See also Lowrie's "Translators and Interpreters of S. K.," *Theology Today*, XII (Oct., 1955), pp. 312-27.
 19. *Come Holy Spirit* (New York: Round Table Press, 1934) contains sermons by Barth and Eduard Thurneysen.
 20. *Creative Controversies in Christianity* (New York: Revell, 1928), pp. 217-18.
 21. *Religion and Life* (Fall, 1933); *A Christian Manifesto* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1934), p. 227.
 22. Horton, *Realistic Theology* (New York: Harpers, 1934), p. 120.
 23. Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* (New York: Harpers, 1935; Meridian-Living Age, 1956), p. 43.
 24. There are useful survey-essays in Arnold S. Nash (ed.), *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1951); see also H. Shelton Smith, *Faith and Nurture* (New York: Scribners, 1941).
 25. Whether editors and contributors to the widely-read denominational and nondenominational periodicals contributed to or merely reflected the communications-breakdown is difficult to say; probably both. The probability that they contributed to it, however, should engender caution in the present day, especially because journalism now as always thrives on conflict.
 26. Stephen Fielding Bayne, *The Optional God*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953); Sidney E. Mead, review of Carter's *Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel*, in *Church History*, XXVI (Dec., 1957), 397 ff.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"An Historical Critique of John Wyclif's Role in the Preaching Tradition Explicated in Terms of His English Sermons and Their Expressed Attitudes toward Biblical Interpretation and the Vernacular Scriptures." By William Mallard, Jr. (Emory University, Georgia). Duke University, June, 1956. Director: Dr. Ray C. Petry.

The body of English sermons attributed to John Wyclif, and consisting largely of translations from his Latin sermons, supplies a valuable source for the study of Wyclif's impact upon vernacular preaching in late 14th century England. The form of the collection is that of a preaching "manual," apparently for the instruction of the "poor preachers." In technique the sermons represent an interesting conservative reaction against both the formal scholastic sermon of the high middle ages and the questionable "jesting" sermon used by the roadside friar. Wyclif reverts to the "postill" type of sermon, the running commentary on Scripture that often employs allegory. This method stands in a long tradition of pastoral instruction from the Bible in the context of worship. It is the emphasis upon Scriptural authority that is truly at the heart of the collection. Allegory applies Scripture to life. But also a kind of "literalism" in approaching the four Gospels sets up a standard for allegorical interpretations and forms the core of a new church law—God's law—to replace the corrupt canon law.

"John Leadley Dagg: Pioneer American Baptist Theologian." Robert G. Gardner (Shorter College, Rome, Georgia). Duke University, 1957. Director: Dr. H. Shelton Smith.

John Leadley Dagg (1794-1884), clergyman, educator, and theologian, produced the first encompassing theological, ecclesiological, and ethical system for the American Baptists. Furthermore, he was the representative religious thinker among the majority of Baptists in the ante-bellum South. He held the traditional view of natural and special religious knowledge, the plenary inspiration of Scripture, the Ussherite chronology of creation, the Augustino-federal doctrine of original sin, the substitutionary atoning work of the God-Man, special providence, election, and particular redemption. His views on baptism, the local church, and closed communion received wide approval. His defense of slavery from the economic, political, and racial standpoints was typical. At the single point of the Church Universal, he differed from his fellows—and this was in degree, not in kind. Almost all except the Landmarkers adopted such a concept, but he alone made extensive mention of it. Hence it is not too much to affirm that Dagg has a double significance: he was the earliest American Baptist theological, ecclesiological, and ethical systematizer, and he was the representative figure among early nineteenth century Baptists in the South.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria. By WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S. J. (Catholic University of American Studies in Christian Antiquity, edited by JOHANNES QUASTEN, No. 14.) Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1957. xvi, 194 pp. \$3.00.

The first thing to say of this admirably printed, eminently readable dissertation, solidly based on historical research, is that its price is amazingly low. Not only is it worth buying; it can be bought, like other excellent volumes in the same series. The second thing to say is that it clarifies an important doctrine, or complex of doctrines, of an important Greek theologian, not only in relation to his own logic (and does not make him more consistent than he is) but also in relation to earlier doctrines, perhaps better known, about the image of God in man. Cyril treats "image" as synonymous with "likeness" in Gen. 1:26-27, and finds the image primarily in man's soul, partly in his reason (not regarded as exclusively intellectual) and his free will. Another aspect of the image is found in man's dominion over irrational creation. But the most important way in which man images God is by sanctification and virtue; Cyril lays stress on imperishability, but it is "only secondarily biological (life); it is primarily theological (God's life)." He links the Christian's divine sonship to "its archetype, the Christ who is God's only Son and yet the first-born of many brethren"—even though at some points he does not work out the implications of this doctrine. Two chapters now deal with problems remaining ambiguous in Cyril's thought: (1) woman is only the image of man, hence only indirectly in God's image (Burghardt rightly notes that more study of patristic misogyny, such as there is, is needed);

(2) it is not clear whether Adam lost, or simply obscured, the divine image. Finally Burghardt shows how in Cyril's thought Christ restored the image of God to mankind.

I have noted only one error, and that on the first page, where "Valentinian" should be "Valentinus." And I miss a thorough treatment of Theophilus, who comments interestingly on the nature of man according to Genesis (*Ad Autolyicum* 2, 17-19, 23-28), though to a considerable extent he is of course a forerunner of the later fathers of Antioch, not those of Alexandria. The work of Karl Barth, *Christ and Adam*, is worth mentioning as evidence for a considerable resemblance between modern and patristic interpretations.

ROBERT M. GRANT

University of Chicago

Early Medieval Theology. Newly translated and edited by GEORGE E. McCracken in collaboration with ALLEN CABANISS (*Library of Christian Classics*, IX). Philadelphia: Westminster Press; London: SCM Press, 1957. 430 pp. \$5.00.

This book exhibits the typical qualities of the *Library of Christian Classics* volumes already published. The editors, both of proved competence as classicists, manifest commendable facility in putting neglected theological materials in clarified historical context. Their working partnership as translators is an effective one. Each exploits a research metier familiar to him with experience gained in previous special projects. The general introduction is brief but adequate. Introductions to individual works are ample and well buttressed from definitive studies in supporting texts and world literature.

The four basic categories under which the works of some fifteen writers are subsumed in large excerpts may seem all too generalized for some tastes: "The Nature of Divine Truth," "God's

Word In Holy Scripture," "The Voice Of The Preacher," and "Ideals Of The Priesthood." This reviewer, however, judges this type of classification to be a virtue, permitting as it does a generous, representative sampling of teachings early regarded as catholic truth, as well as eucharistic interpretation, biblical commentary, homiletical method and practice, and much wise counsel on diocesan responsibility and the *cura animarum*. Possibly more than any series volume to date, this collection makes readily available certain pivotal texts hitherto inaccessible in good English translation. One exception may be Vincent of Lerins, *The Commonitory*, already acceptably presented. The ably annotated selections of Part One, however, drawn from the eucharistic doctrines of Radbertus and Ratramnus, have almost unparalleled usefulness for the non-linguist even as they are highly valuable for the specialist. Selections from "A Reply To The Three Letters" emanating from the church of Lyons give setting to the contributions of Remigius and Deacon Florus, the debate centering in Gottschalk, and the intricate altercation involving Hincmar, Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, and John Scotus Eriugena.

Among the commentary selections in Part Two, those from Gregory the Great and Alcuin of York are perhaps not as distinctively new as those from Claudius of Turin and Rupert of Deutz. Part Three does, in fact, seem to supply the first sizable portion translated into English of Guibert de Nogent's *How To Make A Sermon*. Sermon texts from Rabanus Maurus, Ivo of Chartres, and Agobard of Lyons make up a strong section. The final division (Part Four) highlights an anonymous address to the clergy, Theodulph of Orleans' clerical precepts, and a selection from Bede's *On Bishop Aidan*.

Specialists will welcome the voluminous notes and the enormous range of literature brought to bear upon even the most minor points. This very plethora of sometimes esoteric data may conceivably be a doubtful boon, however, for the more general reader whose

needs the series has tried not to forget. In any case, one of the most noteworthy contributions of the book is the relatively large use made of cross-references to patristic and non-Christian originals and to recent periodical literature in the major languages. Some worthy contributions have, almost inevitably, been overlooked. Protestant and Roman Catholic researches are kept in good balance. The distinctive traits of pertinent biblical versions, the Old Latin included, have been accentuated. It is encouraging to see the graciousness exhibited by Dr. McCracken toward his collaborator and it is inspiring to note Dr. Cabaniss' vigorous response with translations and research summarizations from his cumulative work on Agobard of Lyons, Amalarius of Metz, and others. Indexes are usually full and precise by main entry, rather than by highly organized subdivisions.

RAY C. PETRY

Duke University Divinity School.

Saint Peter Damiani and His Canonical Sources: A Preliminary Study in the Antecedents of the Gregorian Reform. By J. JOSEPH RYAN. ("Studies and Texts," 2) Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1956. 213 pp. \$2.50.

The problem which the author has set for himself is the determination of the particular collections of the sacred canons used by St. Peter Damiani in his numerous writings on behalf of ecclesiastical reform. His method is a minute analysis of every recognizable canonical quotation or allusion in the works of the eminent reformer in an effort to identify the collection from which it was derived. The major part of the book, pages 23-133, consists of the quotation of every such reference from Damian in chronological order, followed in each instance by the passage from which it was quoted or on which the reformer was most likely relying. In many instances Professor Ryan appends a paragraph of commentary on a particular problem or on the

significance of a particular identification.

This is a meticulous and demanding process. The result demonstrates the author's mastery of a mass of technical material, both medieval sources and monographs of modern scholars, and a dedication to the tedious disciplines required by such a project.

Professor Ryan summarizes his conclusions as follows (p. 167):

The composite *Dionysiana*, including the conciliar texts and the decretals, remains the backbone of canonical tradition. The *Decretum* of Burchard, which was in use, in Northern Italy at least, from some time before 1050, is the chief support among the more recent compilations and recommends itself by its general utility. . . . Material excerpted from Pseudo-Isidore is in circulation (with a large dose of it in Burchard), but apparently there is limited contact with the whole Pseudo-Isidorian corpus. Other works, like the tracts of Auxilius, the versions of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, the *Vita Gregorii Magni* of John the Deacon, are being called upon as subsidiary instruments to supply canonical authorities in the service of the Reformers.

For the study of the history of canon law and the influence of particular collections, Ryan's conclusion concerning the penetration of Burchard's *Decretum* into Italy as early as 1046 (p. 161) is significant; it advances the use of the *Decretum* in Italy perhaps a decade earlier than previous known appeals to it. The author provides another significant contrast between the two reforming cardinals, Damiani and Humbert, in that the former relied most heavily on the *Dionysiana* and Burchard, with little use of Pseudo-Isidore, whereas (as A. Michel has demonstrated) the latter set Burchard aside and depended largely on the False Decretals; in a fascinating footnote (p. 169), Ryan raises the question, "Was there such a thing as a Pseudo-Isidorian spirit or mentality?"

For the study of Damiani himself, to which Professor Ryan has previously contributed important clarification, this work is important in emphasizing the solid scholarship which gave stability to his reforming efforts, along with his fiery rhetoric, in expounding his theory of canonical authority, and in demonstrating his relationship to the Gregorian

canonists who came after him.

Probably the most exciting aspect of this book is the promise it gives of future studies to which this meticulous kind of work is foundational. Professor Ryan indicates its importance for a much-needed critical edition of Damiani's works (pp. 136-137), and expresses the desirability, at least, of a full-scale comparative study of Damiani and Humbert (p. 169). In his subtitle itself, he calls this work "a preliminary study in the antecedents of the Gregorian reform." It is to be hoped that the promise there implicit will be realized in such an authoritative work on the reform movement as Professor Ryan is eminently qualified to produce.

RONALD E. OSBORN

*School of Religion
Butler University*

Hugh Du Puiset: A Biography of the Twelfth-Century Bishop of Durham. By G. V. SCAMMELL. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956. x, 355 pp. \$7.50.

Hugh Du Puiset, bishop of Durham from 1154 to 1195, had one of the longest episcopates in the history of the English episcopacy. He was a member of an aggressive French aristocratic family. His uncle was Stephen of Blois, third king of Norman England. The diocese that Stephen and Stephen's influential brother, Henry, bishop of Winchester, secured for Hugh was one of the richest, undoubtedly the most important politically in England, located as it was on the Scottish border and enjoying extensive rights of immunity. Hugh was on personal terms with Stephen, with Henry II, Richard, and John. His estates returned an income which would have kept two kings in reasonable comfort. Nature endowed him with a fine physique and a hardy constitution which enabled him to live an active life until his death. To his superiors and equals he was affable, and he possessed a certain eloquence which afforded him some success as a conciliator. Little wonder then that his name keeps bobbing up with misleading frequency in

the contemporary sources of the time. What is misleading is the inference one might draw, as Stubbs possibly did, when he stated that Puiset's biography "would be a diplomatic or political history of at least fifty eventful years of English national life." It is true that one could write much of the history of the period through Puiset's eyes, but these would be less the eyes of one who helped make that history than those of an interested bystander. Of this Stubbs must have been aware, for he also said that Puiset was "one who had held a great position without being a great man."

But Stubbs surely erred when he stated that Puiset in his episcopate "left a mark upon the north of England which is not yet effaced." Of this Mr. Scammell, despite an exhaustive search through all the documents which Stubbs examined and many more that he never saw, is able to find no evidence. The most he will admit is that "the nature of his rule did little to alter, except in an architectural and fiscal sense, the condition of his see." Puiset's only tangible success came in enlarging and reorganizing the incomes of his highly lucrative liberty, but by means not always ethical, as he himself admitted on his deathbed. Puiset was an opportunist, which accounts for the essential barrenness of his career. Against smaller men opportunism, coupled with his great wealth and prestige, were sufficient. But it required courage to support Henry II and King Richard at every turn in their turbulent careers, and this Puiset did not have. So they withheld from him the confidence and high office he never deserved.

One regret the reader feels in company with Mr. Scammell. That is the author's inability to make Puiset live. He describes him as arrogant, as loving magnificence and opulence, as being occasionally ruthless and unscrupulous—but these qualities are not apparent from the text. This is probably not the author's fault, for medieval chroniclers did not write with the verve of modern columnists. But one wonders whether Mr. Scammell could

not have presented the substance of his not unimportant findings without suffocating them in an overwhelming mass of detail.

JOSEPH H. DAHMUS
Pennsylvania State University

A History of Antony Bek. By C. M. FRASER. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957. 266 pp. \$6.75.

A History of Antony Bek by C. M. Fraser adds another scholarly biography to the growing list of studies of eminent English churchmen. This is a biography of a different sort of churchman. Bek was neither saint nor scholar, but his kind was not uncommon in the Middle Ages. He was perhaps Edward I's most trusted and industrious counsellor and diplomat. He even undertook to lead troops. Bek owed his rise to the see of Durham to Edward's favor, which the king bestowed in recognition for services rendered, but more for others yet to come, to cover the expenses of which Durham's lucrative income would be needed. According to the author, "In Durham Bek was king in all but name," and that for a purpose. Whether this extended to the point of building Durham into a powerful autonomous state between England and Scotland where royal officials dared not intrude, is doubtful. But Edward was willing to insist on occasion that "the bishop of Durham has a double status, namely, the status of bishop as to his spiritualities, and the status of earl palatine as to his temporal holdings." Only when Bek's ability to deliver much-needed troops toward the pacification of Scotland faltered did Edward seek to curb the ambitions of his lord palatine.

This is an admirable study. It impresses the student. It will even attract the general reader, no mean accomplishment since the author appears to have found space for every last reference to Bek which his painstaking search through the sources uncovered. As the study unfolds, the reader keeps asking himself why a man of Bek's stature and far-flung activities lacked a biographer until now. Bek's career reflects many significant facets of me-

dieval and English history. It throws light on Edward's attitude toward the church: he was constantly concerned with reducing papal power in English affairs; on Edward's extremely active though generally ineffective diplomatic service: like most medieval monarchs, he lacked money; on the interminable and undignified contests over their respective rights in the matter of ecclesiastical visitation between Bek and his chapter and Bek and his archbishop. Bek won both contests. The church was the loser as she was similarly in the scores of other struggles over jurisdictional rights, which apparently required the cataclysm of the Protestant Reformation before a halt was made to the prodigious amount of time, effort, and money they consumed, to say nothing of the bitterness they engendered and the scandal they created.

Bek's character emerges in lines amazingly sharp for the Middle Ages. His actions speak louder than the words of personal reference medieval sources usually leave unsaid. But it would be difficult to express words more revealing of the man's character than those of his own angry boast in the course of his dispute with Durham convent, that "not for pope, nor king, nor archbishop nor any other would he desist before he had accomplished his purpose." One can only marvel at the success of this man in browbeating chapter, metropolitan, and crown officials, on the one hand, while able, on the other, to convince king and pope that his motives were thoroughly unselfish and his objectives correct. Granted his powers of persuasiveness, one ventures the doubt whether king and pope would have proved as cooperative had they both not been impressed with Bek's ability to raise money and troops. (The pope was interested in a Crusade.) Bek served his king well, but his kind was a load for the church to bear. As one of the men of Durham protested who objected to Bek's strategy in fighting the Scots: "It is not for you, sir bishop, to teach us now of fighting, rather you should be busy at Mass." But the reader of medieval history must always keep

reminding himself that, in this case as in so many others, it was the state, not the church, which had selected Bek.

JOSEPH H. DAHMUS
Pennsylvania State University

The Pursuit of the Millennium. By NORMAN COHN. London: Secker and Warburg, 1957. xvi, 476 pp., including an appendix, bibliography and index. 42 shillings.

At the beginning of this book there is a quotation from Fontenelle to the effect that the history of human delusions can never be sufficiently studied if we are to realize our capacity for error and learn to avoid the pitfalls of our predecessors. It is in this spirit and with a wealth of documentation that Professor Cohn surveys afresh medieval apocalyptic chiliasm. Millenarianism (and by inference, the perversion of the idea of progress which characterizes modern popular totalitarian movements) is here interpreted as a syndrome of irrational responses elicited by the exigencies of economic and social hardships in groups possessing an intellectual climate favorable to such responses. With this approach doctrinal or ideological differences between popular eschatological movements and between Communism and Nazism, which are also touched upon, are less important than the essential identity of their social causes and the similarity of their modes of response. Such oversimplification mars an otherwise valuable work. For it is these differences between them and other eschatologically oriented movements that make of postmillenarianism and Communism beliefs capable of transcending the limitations of the social circumstances which foster them.

It was the cruder forms of chiliasm which sporadically convulsed Europe from 1074, when the burghers of Cologne rebelled against their lord the Archbishop, to 1535, when the Prince Bishop of Münster stormed that city and put a bloody end to the kingdom of John of Leyden. Münster may be said to mark a culmination and turning point. Subsequently the ideal of the New Jerusalem did not find such

strong support on purely local levels, on the level of the commune and the religious brotherhood. It remained a property of the sects, but in addition, after the first half of the sixteenth century chiliasm ceased to be sporadic and was channeled into the hope of the Reformation, leavening also the consciousness of national identities and destinies.

Professor Cohn sees the traditions of the Apocalypse and the earthly Kingdom of God as a mechanism with which discontented groups were at once able to rationalize their suffering and justify their revolutionary programs. The Antichrist of the chiliasts was almost always at hand in their real or imagined oppressors. And depending on local conditions Antichrist was the rich, the Jews, and the Church, any one, or any combination of these three. The hatred of the Jews was in this connection, Professor Cohn believes, quite novel, having its roots in a social sickness which is convincingly traced. Less convincing is the manner of treating the hatred of the Church mainly as a particular aspect of the hatred of the rich and the privileged. This could not be the whole truth, even for popular eschatology. It is worth recalling that the Catholic Church was not merely unapostolical in its privileges and opulence; for most chiliasts it was doctrinally in error.

The disruptive, revolutionary characteristics of the medieval chiliastic groups are of course the most arresting. They were amoral, egalitarian, and anarchic. But was it in the nature of chiliasm itself to inflame discontent and breed moral and political excesses? Or was chiliasm a mere channel for social discontent? On this Professor Cohn is not altogether clear. He would seem to be saying "yes" to both questions. A valuable appendix on the amorality of the Ranters during the Puritan Revolution reminds the reader that after all the Ranters were no more chiliastic than the Quakers or the Baptists or countless other Englishmen in this period. That point suggests that if chiliasm may open the way to wild fantasies and wilder behaviour it does not

necessarily cause or even predispose toward such fanaticism. It may as well lead to Quietism. It seems true, however, that there must have been a subterranean tradition which hallowed the more extreme patterns of response. This study suggests the continuity of such a tradition, and as an analysis of the significance of the forms and the persistence of these aberrations it is masterful. For an understanding of our own time, when we have seen "a paranoid mass movement capture political power," it is particularly suggestive.

MICHAEL FIXLER

Northwestern University

Late Medieval Mysticism (Library of Christian Classics, XIII.) By RAY C. PETRY. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957. 424 pp. \$5.00.

The meticulous and comprehensive scholarship which has gone into the preparation of this volume makes it an outstanding contribution to the literature of mysticism and to the series of which it forms a part. After an extensive General Introduction in which the author defines the concept of mysticism and surveys the representative mystics from Plato to Bernard of Clairvaux—a period of some fifteen hundred years—he then selects out of the great host of possible subjects only those who qualify as the outstanding representatives. They range from Bernard of Clairvaux to and including Catherine of Genoa—a period of over four hundred years. He introduces each of the fifteen mystics thus selected with a brief but adequate biographical sketch and follows it by an exhaustive and evaluative bibliographical essay. This is then amplified by an interpretative synopsis of the work or works, selections of which are given in the text. This introductory material, prepared with exemplary care and exhaustive references to the primary sources and secondary works, affords the reader, despite its brevity, competent guidance for a more exhaustive study of each individual section. Selections from the most important writings of the mystics are reprinted from the already

published standard translations of these works. The excerpts are necessarily brief, for otherwise it would not have been possible to include the comparatively large number of subjects in one volume.

It is this aspect of the editorial policy which raises the only critical consideration in the mind of the present reviewer, despite the full knowledge that Dr. Petry did not have full control over it. Would it not have been better to make fewer selections and thus make it possible to include either the full text of some of the treatises or at least larger portions of them? For not even in the case of St. Francis of Assisi, whose authentic writings are pitifully few and short, was it possible to include them all. But having suggested that fewer selections would perhaps have had certain merit, it is obviously useless and self-contradictory to point out such significant omissions as those of *The Cloud of Unknowing* and Gerard Groote's *The Following of Christ* or its related Thomas a Kempis' *Imitation of Christ*. It is not difficult to anticipate the crushing answer to such foolhardy suggestions: the inclusion of the additional treatises would necessarily reduce the space available for the rest. The only thing that could be said is that under the circumstances perhaps some other choice among the mystics could have been made; but under no circumstances could they all be included. And those that were selected are eminently worthy of the honor of inclusion.

Accordingly, the volume under review is one that will undoubtedly become an almost indispensable handbook and guide for anyone studying the difficult and perplexing subject of mysticism. The masterful competence displayed by the editor cannot but greatly ease the laborious task of such a student, be he a beginner or a mature scholar. As such the work is warmly and unreservedly recommended.

MATTHEW SPINKA

Claremont, California

Conrad Celtis, the German Arch-Humanist. By LEWIS W. SPITZ.

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University press, 1957. xiv, 142 pp. \$3.25.

Professor Spitz has made us his debtors for this sketch of Celtis' life and works. His bibliographical essay (pp. 121-3) shows that he worked with largely good critical editions of the writings. He is one who can say much in little, for he writes about a many-sided man of whom each side is worth very much more space than it gets. The eleven chapters deal with Celtis the first (German) poet laureate, the wandering humanist, Ingolstadt and the reform of university education, Nuremberg and the *Norimberga*, the Rhenish Sodality, the Danubian Sodality, Celtis in Maximilian's Vienna, Celtis the playwright, the poet, the patriot, the philosopher. Some of these chapters could easily be divided so that the table of contents would show Celtis' significance for music, also as a hunter of manuscripts (e.g., of Roswitha), or as a correspondent. A reviewer ought not to tell the writer how he should have done his book, but he may express astonishment at finding only ten pages devoted to Celtis as a poet, seeing he was above all a poet.

The author is cautious about generalizations, for throughout he gives proof of knowing the dangers of compression in so complex a subject. But if he must use not much over a hundred pages, he cannot raise questions and make qualifications in every paragraph. Here are a couple of places where he nodded. He says that generally "the German humanists from Agricola on considered themselves promoters of Plato, or more properly, of neoplatonism, according to their lights. Celtis was in the forefront . . ." (p. 10 f.). This coupling of Agricola with Celtis as promoting neoplatonism is not uncommon. One finds it in L. Häusser, *Geschichte der Rheinischen Pfalz* (Heidelberg 1845), I, 437: "Wie bei Celtes und auch bei Agricola wird die neuerblühte antike Philosophie, jener florentinische Platonismus . . . hineingezogen." Speaking only of Rudolph Agricola, I have found no evidence in his writings of his promoting

this Platonism. Too, there is a statement that "Agricola may be considered the first German humanist in the full sense of the word," but that "there was much in Agricola which did not stem from the spirit of Italian humanism," for "he kept his earnest piety rooted in his boyhood days in Groningen" and "he reflected in many areas of thought a conservative outlook" (p. 4). This raises the question of what is the "spirit" of Italian humanism. Is it something not compatible with piety whether rooted in an Italian or even a Groningen boyhood? And what is conservatism? Nizolius charged both Valla and Agricola with the same kind of conservatism while praising both as trail-blazers.

Now why should this book be reviewed in a periodical devoted to church history? Surely, Celtis was eminent in neither piety nor ecclesiastical interest. Professor Spitz does not make of him a precursor of the Reformation as such, but he writes brilliantly about his work of inflaming national patriotism which, in turn, was a factor in the Reform (pp. 93-104). The author hopes "that Celtis will here emerge from the shrouds of time and documentary Latinity with some measure of that vitality which characterized his personality and colorful career" (p. ix). Spitz has succeeded admirably. The enthusiasm of Celtis for humanism was infectious, and the church historian will wonder with the author whether this man could have left aught but a deep impression on a reformer who was once his pupil, namely Zwingli (p. 71).

The author's style makes the book a joy to read. The last sentence on p. 43 has antecedent trouble. The references in the notes should make a good guide through Celtis' works. There is a substantial cross-index.

QUIRINUS BREEN

University of Oregon

The Holy Pretence: A Study in Christianity and Reason of State from William Perkins to John Winthrop. By GEORGE L. MOSSE. Ox-

ford: Basil Blackwell, 1957. 159 pp. 21s.

A Jacobean pamphleteer furnished the title for this book when he advised the King that if the people should prove to be unreasonable he must "bow for a time and little by little bring them to his purpose by some craft or by some *holy pretence*." In part, the "holy pretence" in England represented the assimilation of a frankly utilitarian ethic—the so-called Machiavellian concept of "reason of state." A more significant facet of the adoption of the "holy pretence," however, was the earnest endeavor of English divines to utilize the concept as a means of effectively relating Christian faith and Christian morality to the practical political issues of the time. It was therefore for these divines no mere naked ethic of power but an attempt to maintain a positive relationship between the Christian ethic and the necessities presented by harsh political realities.

The author of the present study may have over-estimated the influence of Machiavelli and Machiavellianism on the development of the "holy pretence," for "reason of state" is little more than what is dictated by common sense. As John Levett noted in 1598, Machiavelli maintained nothing but what the "most part of the wiser sort have always affirmed." In many ways, however, the influence of Machiavelli in particular and Renaissance political thought in general is incidental to the main conclusions which the author has reached as a result of his studies.

The casuistical divinity of the Jesuits brought the term "casuistry" into disrepute and gained for the Jesuits a reputation for dissimulation and treachery. This traditional judgment does less than justice to the Jesuits, who were forced to resolve highly complex and ambiguous "cases of conscience" and serves to obscure the fact that all Christians were confronted by the same ethical dilemmas. One of the important features of the present study is the documentation by the author of "the essential similarity of the 'holy pretence' in all of the Christian thought" of the period. Roman Catholics, Anglicans,

and Puritans are shown to be occupying much the same ground in terms of their application of the dictates of Christian morality to specific issues of conscience.

The author's focus of attention is upon the Puritans, and the book serves to correct the conventional portrait of the Puritan at two points. First of all, the Puritan is shown to be much less rigid and unyielding in his moralism than he is usually thought to have been. By utilizing the concept of "reason of state," which he preferred to call "prudence" rather than "craft" or "guile," he was able to meet most situations with considerable flexibility while not releasing his actions from the judgment of the Christian ethic. In the second place, contrary to the contention of Alan Simpson, there is very little "utopianism" to be found in Puritan casuistry.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate Rochester Divinity School

The Moral Revolution of 1688. By DUDLEY W. BAHLMAN. [Wallace Notestein Essays, No. 2] New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. vii, 112 pp. \$3.00.

Clergymen and pious laymen living in England during the Glorious Revolution frequently viewed the turbulence of their times in moral, rather than political, perspective. To the spiritually-minded, the coronation of William and Mary symbolized a return of social propriety as much as it did a constitutional settlement. Under the new sovereigns, it was hoped, the decline of manners could be halted, complacency in religion could be harried out of the land, and the shocking profligacy of English cities could be summarily curbed. Historians have usually neglected to say so, but for twenty years following 1688 reforming societies pressed vigorously and systematically for the control of such social blights as prostitution, sodomy, blasphemy, drunkenness, and gambling. The purpose of these groups was at once charitable and patriotic: by stemming the tide of vice they would save souls; by saving souls they would strengthen England.

The Moral Revolution of 1688 describes the origin, activities, and decline of the societies for the reformation of manners, in the first account published since Garnet V. Portus, *Caritas Anglicana* (1912). The need for associations of virtuous men became apparent after vigilant action by a few magistrates, royal letters expressing concern over the state of morals, and frequent sermons on the subject, failed to arouse public interest in a concerted effort to stamp out moral decay. The societies were founded because, as the author puts it (p. 30) "in the war against vice England had suddenly found herself without an army."

The first society was formed about 1690 in London's East End. So successful were its efforts to suppress bawdy-houses and curb public drunkenness and profanity that the example was soon copied. By 1701 there were twenty such societies in London, while others were found at Canterbury, Gloucester, Hull, Chester, Nottingham, Carlisle, and elsewhere in England, as well as at Carmarthen, Wales, and on the Isle of Wight. Membership varied from place to place; some were composed exclusively of Anglicans, others admitted dissenters, and one at Portsmouth was made up solely of public officials. All followed business-like principles of organization and management. Periodic meetings were scheduled, detailed records were kept, and executive committees directed programs tailored to local needs.

In suppressing vice several tactics were employed. Weekly, quarterly, and annual sermons were endowed, and the best pulpit orators engaged to preach. Books and pamphlets calling for reform were written and distributed. Committees of society members ferreted out disorderly behavior and began legal proceedings, relying, as often as not, upon evidence procured by paid informers. Political pressure was brought to bear upon constables and magistrates who refused to arrest and punish wrongdoers.

Eventually the societies became involved in the political strife of Queen Anne's reign and declined. After 1710, virtuous Englishmen, concerned more

with organized charity and the improvement of man than they had ever before, endorsed other means of change. While Mr. Bahlman adds little factual information to that available in the Portus account, he has contributed a thorough, lively, up-to-date, interpretive study of the societies and their significance. In every way this second volume of the Notestein Essays lives up to the high literary standard established for the series by Professor Otis Pease.

WILLIAM A. BULTMANN
Arkansas State Teachers College

North Country Bishop; A Biography of William Nicholson. By FRANCIS GODWIN JAMES. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956. 330 pp. \$4.50.

This is a scholarly reconstruction of the career of a minor figure in the Anglican episcopate—William Nicholson (1655-1727), the son of a Cumberland parson who became fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, archdeacon and bishop of Carlisle, and for the last eight years of his life, Bishop of Derry. The principal source is a diary which covers his years as bishop. The project originated in one of Wallace Notestein's seminars at Yale and Mr. James combines the conscientiousness of that school with its freedom from sectarian bias and its personal knowledge of the English scene. The result is not without its interest. We hear about the problems of a border diocese, the retaliations of parson and squire, the squabbles in the chapter, the world of scholarship in which Nicholson had a foothold as a Saxonist and antiquarian, the world of ecclesiastical politics in which the Stuart tory became a Revolution tory and finally a church-whig. Though capable of sinking to the excommunication of an ecclesiastical opponent, Nicholson was no discredit to his order. If no spiritual leader, he had his share of practical piety. If he took the usual care of his family and friends—he went to Derry to get dowries for his daughters—the church was not ill-served by his appointments. Learning had his blessing.

Hospitality was discharged. Duties in church and state were duly performed. If there were strict limits to the affection which a "foreign" bishop could earn in Derry, he seems to have been liked and respected in Carlisle. And though narrow in some of his partisan loyalties, he showed breadth and courage in more than one national issue.

The disappointments of the book can hardly be blamed on the author. A minor figure in every way, Nicholson has not left the kind of material that would make him an absorbing human being. His thoughts and feelings are only occasionally seen at close range. The diaries are dull fare, the daily round and the traffic with great events sparingly chronicled. Additions to knowledge can be wrung from this material, but not a living biography.

However, specialists in the period will be glad to see another contribution to a group of lives which began with Norman Sykes' pioneer work on Edward Gibson in 1926, and now includes Edward Carpenter on Tenison, Sherlock and Compton, A. Tindall Hart on Sharp and Lloyd, C. E. Whiting on Crewe, and Sykes on Wake. We are, becoming better informed about the episcopate of this period than of almost any other in English history.

ALAN SIMPSON
University of Chicago

William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737. By NORMAN SYKES. 2 vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1957. xiii, 366, 289 pp. \$15.00.

William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury from 1716 to 1737, has suffered relative neglect at the hands of historians who have been frightened by the sheer bulk of his manuscript remains, which include thirty-one bound volumes of correspondence. Professor Sykes has spent the major portion of his career in seeking to remove this lacuna in the history of the English church, and has produced a scholarly biography of great distinction and real importance. In addition to deciphering the rough draft copies of Wake's correspondence, Professor Sykes has made

full use of collections of his letters at Basle, Berne, Geneva, Lausanne, Zurich, Paris, and Dublin. He also had the good fortune to discover a manuscript autobiography which had been in private hands for over two hundred years.

Wake was not a conspicuous success as archbishop of Canterbury, and Professor Sykes acknowledges that he was ill-equipped to serve as primate of all England. He loved the quiet life of the student, disliked the rough-and-tumble of politics, and lacked the flexibility necessary to effect satisfactory working relationships with others. His uncompromising hostility toward Dissenters and his unyielding defense of the violation of the rights granted them by the Act of Toleration wrecked the Church-Whig alliance and led to his own exclusion from the councils of state. By 1723 he had been forced into virtual retirement, and the Bishop of London — to whom Walpole and Townshend turned as their ecclesiastical counselor and agent—was able to make the grim jest that "an archbishop has nothing to do, but to make two dinners a week and to sign dispensations."

Although Wake was of some significance as an ecclesiastic, being active in the Convocation controversy in the reign of Queen Anne, in addition to his unhappy role in partisan politics, and fostering the missionary enterprise in North America and South India; his real importance was in the realm of theological and historical scholarship. He was something of a curious personality, being intolerant of Dissent at home but spending his life seeking to effect the reunion of Christendom abroad. He was engaged in two parallel sets of negotiations. On the one hand, he carried on an extensive correspondence with Lutheran and Reformed churchmen seeking to effect a Protestant Union; and, on the other hand, he was negotiating with leading French divines in an effort to achieve a union of the French and English churches. In the latter endeavor, he became involved in an extensive discussion of the validity of Anglican orders

and the theological standpoint of the Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer. His most lasting influence has been in terms of a definition of what he regarded as a specifically Anglican position. One of his real services to historical scholarship was his exposure of the Nag's Head story of Matthew Parker's consecration as a mere fable.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON
Colgate Rochester Divinity School

The Great Awakening in New England. By EDWIN SCOTT GAUSTAD. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. 173 pp. \$3.00.

The Great Awakening is narrowly defined in this book as an episode in New England Congregationalism that occurred in 1741-43. The account of what happened during these years is based on a thorough study of the sources, although it adds little of significance to what was already known.

Unfortunately, the book lacks interest because it evades the major issues of causation and interpretation. It is "up to date" in being sympathetic to revivalism of the Edwardean variety, but is otherwise innocent of modern sociological or psychological insights. The socio-economic interpretations of secular historians are rejected, doubtless correctly, but no intelligible explanation of the revival as a cultural phenomenon is offered in their place. The author is content to echo the contemporary verdict that the revival was as inexplicable in its appearance as meteorites. Curiously enough, he cites but fails to explore the significance of Edwards' opinion that vigorous preaching of the doctrine of justification by faith was a crucial factor.

The revival itself is said to have had no geographical or social boundaries, to have been both rural and urban, and to have reached upper and lower class alike. There is certainly some evidence to support this opinion; but does the total weight of evidence support it? The author overlooks the well-informed judgment both of Edwards and of Chauncy that the revival did indeed divide the population along

social class lines. He minimizes the complexity of the revival by regarding it as somehow the peculiar property of Congregationalists, which they succeeded in containing within their ecclesiastical structure. Thus it was not until "long after the Awakening" that revivalism became the ally of an uneducated clergy. If so, why was lay exhortation a principal issue from the beginning? And what of the Connecticut Separate clergy, none of whom were college graduates? There were admittedly "revival extremists" on the fringes of the Awakening, but they are dismissed as an insignificant aberration. Actually, their premillennialism and radical perfectionism were to remain staple ingredients of sectarian revivalism for two centuries—an aberration perhaps, but scarcely insignificant.

If he is cautious as to causes the author is reckless as to consequences. "All phases of subsequent American life" felt the effects of the Awakening. Various institutional and theological consequences are alleged to have flowed from the revival, although a critical reader may desire a more circumstantial account of how these consequences stemmed from the event itself. Much of the difficulty arises from the too readily accepted assumption that the revival died in 1743. An influential segment of Congregationalism remained committed to revivalism; the Separate movement reached its peak in the 1750's; and defections of revivalists to the Baptists and later to the Methodists continued to occur. But this is a history which remains to be written.

STOW PERSONS

State University of Iowa

German Culture in America, 1600-1900: Philosophical and Literary Influences. By HENRY A. POCHMANN. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957. xiii, 865 pp. \$7.50.

In his *Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century* (1803) Samuel Miller confesses that "it would be improper to pass in silence the celebrated IMMANUEL KANT, Professor at Koenigsberg, in Prussia." He also concedes that the "Critical Philosophy . . . will long be ranked among the most curious and interesting of the age"; but he ventures only a few cautious, second-hand remarks as to its nature and argument. The nineteenth century would change this sense of remoteness; and German thinking in the widest sense would be woven into the American nation's culture. To this century-long process of creative assimilation all but the first forty pages of this massive historico-biographical account are devoted. The text proper is divided into two sections: one of about 350 double-columned pages on "German Thought in America," another of nearly 150 pages on "German Literary Influence." Three hundred pages of dense yet often discursive notes are divided proportionately. About two-thirds of the text consists of over a hundred sketches of individual American thinkers and writers, some of them a few lines in length, some of them complete essays. On deposit at the University of Wisconsin library is the initial manuscript which was almost three times as large! Despite its size and "factuality," however, the book is very readable. Like its large companion volume, the 12,000-item *Bibliography of German Culture in America to 1940* (512 pp., \$6.50) it will certainly become a standard reference work.

The first duty of a church-historical reviewer, perhaps, is to explain that Professor Pochmann is something of a latitudinarian about the meaning of "literary and philosophical." Almost a third of the book could with justice be called "theological" or "religious," and much more than that is of fairly direct significance to church history. The more specifically related portions tend to pertain to early nineteenth-century New England, however. They thin out and virtually disappear for the later period when German theological influences actually swell to flood-tide. Moses Stuart, James Marsh, and the Transcendentalists are discussed in some detail. Emerson, in fact, receives nearly seven times as much space as the whole group of great *fin-de-siècle*

idealists (Creighton, Royce, Bowne, etc.). The post-Civil War influence of German church historians, biblical critics, and theologians is outside the purview of the volume.

The most basic value of the book is its factual and bibliographical documentation of the enormous role of German thought and writing in America. Though this influence has been generally recognized, the book indicates many areas of contact that almost no one person not specializing in the field would ever be likely to know about. By the same token, I do not know where, if at all, the author has pressed out beyond special monographic literature on specific Americans. In the philosophy section, at least, I feel that such scholarly advances are fairly rare, though it must be added that the enormous breadth of the survey actually precludes such a contribution. The single most serious effort (treated also in the author's earlier work on *New England Transcendentalism and St. Louis Hegelianism* [1948]) is a fifty-page study of Emerson's thought (with 581 footnotes) which attempts to show successive Platonic (to 1830), Kantian (1830-38), Neo-Platonic (1838-50) and Hegelian-Darwinian phases. The essay is not as dogmatic or labored as this scheme suggests, and is an important contribution. The forty-page survey of "The Vogue of German Literature" introducing the literary section of the book is far more relevant, and revealing, than the sleuthing into "Germanic Materials and Motifs in the Short Story" which follows. The next hundred pages on individual poets, novelists, and critics is a fairly wearying recital at the far pole from significant literary criticism. Yet the author would probably reply that it is not intended as literary criticism but as a basic kind of source-study. I would continue to insist, however, that the lack of synthetic comment and interpretation (the need for which is stated in the Introduction) is a serious shortcoming. Putting the book down, I can not shake the image of an immensely long thread (so long that at no one point can both ends be seen) on which

is strung every single item in grandmother's button box: her diamonds and pearls, her huge chips of quartz, and the minute glass beads that were really meant for curtain fringes. If I am complaining unjustifiably because Professor Pochmann did not write another book rather than the one here published, let me express my hope that he turn his erudition to the interpretive task in another volume.

Actually if you want a thumbnail sketch and brief evaluation of Charles T. Brooks or Bayard Taylor, both translators of Goethe's *Faust*, you can find it here. If you wish the background for Walt Whitman's advertisement that *Leaves of Grass* was "an organic outgrowth and consistent illustration of the system of thought developed in successive stages by Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel," you can find it. If you want an integrated essay on German influences coming full circle from the Early Transcendentalists through the St. Louis Hegelians and back to the Concord School of Philosophy, you can find it. The cumulative effect of these findings, moreover, will probably lead to some serious questions about the American character. Even without the similar volumes that are being or could be written on sociology, historiography, psychology, natural science, and theology, it seems to me that the problems posed by America's Germanic enthusiasms demand more serious thought than they have received.

In the last analysis we are deeply indebted to the author's indefatigable labors and innumerable discerning judgments. We are also grateful that so large and detailed a volume could be made available at so nominal a price.

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM

Yale University

Parson Clapp of the Strangers' Church of New Orleans. Edited by JOHN DUFFY. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957. ix, 191 pp. Illustrations. \$5.00.

This book, bearing the imprint of the Louisiana State University Studies, has been selected for publication because of its particular interest to

Louisiana. However, the time and scene of Parson Clapp's activities widen his appeal and audience. Mr. Duffy in editing and reprinting the autobiographical sketches of Theodore Clapp has made a very fine study of a controversial figure, has presented him with clarity, tender understanding, and keen evaluation. Mr. Duffy is enthusiastic over his subject, but never allows himself to be swept away by Clapp's egotistical recountings of his thirty-five years spent in New Orleans. He with good judgment and critical acumen sees through the soft veil of remoteness with which Clapp wrote and properly places both Clapp and the reader in the New Orleans scene of 1822-1856.

In three introductory chapters the editor deals with Clapp's theological views and his ministerial career. Clapp, a staunch Puritan preacher in Massachusetts moved by the religious ferment of the early 19th century, renounced his traditional training and orthodoxy and accepted the humanism of Unitarian philosophy which flourished around Harvard and Boston. Renouncing his Congregational pulpit and charge, Clapp left New England and moved to New Orleans where he served as a Presbyterian minister for thirteen years. Following expulsion from the Presbyterian Church, Clapp, supported by many followers, organized the First Congregational Church on the basis that he was an independent preacher and that the church was without doctrines. As a strong individualist and as a nonconformist, he found

life pleasant in New Orleans. The cosmopolitan city afforded an interesting and variable pattern into which he agreeably infused the flowering philosophy of New England. There, in a region basically fundamentalist, Clapp modified his own ideas and held the support of a large congregation until his retirement shortly before the Civil War.

The basis for this book is a partial reprint of Theodore Clapp's *Autobiographical Sketches and Recollections*, first published in 1857. With remarkable memory for details and talent for description, Clapp presents a vivid picture, if not accurate, of New Orleans. Assuming in a degree the role of an impresario, Clapp enjoyed the social life of the city, the changing political scene, and the growing industrial center. Yellow fever and cholera recurrently scourged the city, halted normal activities, and decimated the inhabitants. Throughout twenty epidemics Clapp remained in the city serving the sick and the dying. Without modesty but with skill, Clapp recounts the days of disease, fear and despair.

Any student of this period and locale would do well to read the autobiography of Theodore Clapp and the excellent editorial notes of John Duffy. It is unfortunate that the press chose to produce the book by an offset process of poor quality.

WALTER B. POSEY

*Agnes Scott College and
Emory University*

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

April 19, 1958

President Williams called the meeting to order at Concordia Theological Seminary, with Harold Grimm, Robert Handy, Winthrop S. Hudson, Robert Michaelsen, and Carl Schneider present. The minutes were approved as printed in *Church History*.

The following persons were elected members of the Society, subject to the usual constitutional provision: George S. Bebis, Ralph Bieber, Clifton Courtney, Jr., David R. Eilder, Richard A. Henshaw, Hans J. Hillerbrand, Robert R. Hooper, Norman F. Kinzie, Miss Nancy Knapp, C. D. McKelvy, Herman F. Nelson, Clair A. Popp, Henry W. Reimann, J. Alton Templin, James F. White.

Moved, seconded, and voted that the Society encourage Profs. Giorgio Spini, Eugenio Garin, Delio Cantimori, and Luigi Firpo to pursue the possibility of publishing a critical edition of all the writings of the Italian Reformers of the sixteenth century.

Moved, seconded, and voted that the committee on indexing be given power to proceed with the project, subject to an expense limitation of \$150.

Moved, seconded, and voted that we view with enthusiasm the proposal that regional meetings of church historians be held beginning in the fall to examine their understanding of what they are doing—their presuppositions, and principles of selection of material—with a view to the possibility of reconceiving their role in the teaching of church history, and that the president, with the co-operation of Raymond Albright, Richard M. Cameron and John Brush, be authorized to proceed with formulating specific plans and selecting and calling together re-

gional leaders. Travel and secretarial expense of the president and regional chairmen ought to be regarded as a legitimate charge against the grant.

The Council received news of two projects involving the publication of primary source materials and urged that the persons participating consult with each other. It was the opinion of the Council that the publication of such materials is exceedingly important and greatly needed.

Moved, seconded, and voted that the vice-president explore the possibility of a three-way joint meeting with the Medieval Academy and the Catholic Historical Society at the December sessions in 1960, and that the possibility of a joint Spring meeting with the Mississippi Valley Historical Society also be explored.

Moved, seconded, and voted that all officers of the Society at the expiration of their respective terms of office turn over all correspondence to the Secretary, who will classify it and then deposit it with the Treasurer.

The program included the following papers: "Lutheran Immigrants Face the Frontier" by Carl S. Meyer; "The Religious Heritage of the Midwest" by Sidney E. Mead; "Puritanism and Democracy in the New Model Army" by Leo F. Solt; "An Inquiry into the Demise of English Presbyterianism: 1660-1760" by James C. Spaulding; "Savonarola, Florence, and the Millenarian Tradition" by Donald Weinstein; and "The Case of Athanasius against Arius" by Samuel Laeuchli.

The Council adjourned.

Attest: Winthrop S. Hudson
Secretary.

Princeton UNIVERSITY PRESS

Missionaries, Chinese, and Diplomats

**The American Protestant Missionary Movement
in China, 1890-1952**

By **PAUL A. VARG**

The American Protestant missionary movement in China began in the 1830's, came to full bloom after 1890, and was eclipsed by the Communist Revolution a scant 60 years later. This book goes beyond the missionary movement to show the tragic conflict of two basically different cultures, Western and Oriental, that never came to a full understanding of each other. The author, approaching the missionary movement as an objective outsider, devotes considerable attention to the interplay of missionary activity and the United States policy in China as well as to the crucial question of why the Communists succeeded in China where the West failed.

348 pages. \$6.00

Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135

By **NORMAN F. CANTOR**

In the latter part of the 11th century a revolutionary group within the Western Church, centered in the papacy, attempted to overthrow the early medieval system of church-state relations by which the church in each country was under the control of kings and other secular rulers. Covering the period from the death of Archbishop Lanfranc in 1099 to the end of the reign of Henry I in 1135, this book provides a detailed history of the attempts to carry out this revolution, known as the Gregorian reform movement. It carefully weighs the issues and analyzes the causes for the failure of the movement, decisive for the future of the English Church. *Princeton Studies in History, No. 10.*

336 pages. Illustrated. \$6.00

Order from your bookstore, or

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

Princeton, New Jersey

Announcing

**THE
FRANCIS PARKMAN
PRIZE for 1958**

The prize of \$500 is to be awarded for a book published in 1958 in the field of American history or biography which manifests history distinction.

Copies are to be sent to each of the three judges of the Committee of Awards.

For further information address

RUDOLF A. CLARKE, Executive Vice President

The Society of American Historians, Inc.

120 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

Attention: Mr. Clarke